Withdrawn
for sale

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

BY THE SAME AUTHOR

THE LIFE AND TEACHING OF JESUS THE CHRIST. 12s. net

THE DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH AND CHRISTIAN REUNION. Bampton Lectures, 1920. 12s. net

HISTORY, AUTHORITY, AND THEOLOGY. 6s. net

ST. PAUL AND CHRISTIANITY. 6s. net

THE MIRACLES OF THE NEW TESTAMENT. 7s. 6d. net

All rights reserved.

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

BY THE

RT. REV. ARTHUR C. HEADLAM, C.H., D.D.

BISHOP OF GLOUCESTER

FORMERLY FELLOW OF ALL SOULS' COLLEGE, OXFORD
PRINCIPAL OF KING'S COLLEGE, LONDON
AND REGIUS PROFESSOR OF DIVINITY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD

WITH AN APPENDIX

BY THE

REV. H. MAYNARD SMITH, D.D.

CANON OF GLOUCESTER

LONDON

JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET, W.

1924

33555

S

T.2156

53572.

283

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY
BILLING AND SONS, LTD., GUILDFORD AND ESHER

NORWICH PUBLIC LIBRARIES

PREFACE

THIS volume is composed of the Charge to the Cathedral Church and to the Clergy and Churchwardens of the Diocese prepared for my Primary Visitation. Owing to special circumstances only the first two chapters of the Charge and the last two Addresses to the Members of the Cathedral Church were actually delivered, as I found it necessary to dispense with the presence of the Clergy at the Visitation, and to leave the Chancellor of the Diocese to administer the Oath to the Churchwardens. Most of the Clergy will now, for the first time, become acquainted with the contents of this Charge. I have not, however, thought it necessary to remove the marks of its origin. A Charge does not deal with its subject in quite the formal manner of a set book. It discusses each point in close relationship with the problems and needs of the Diocese and of the particular occasions when it was delivered. There should be in it a personal touch, and for that personal touch I do not think that any apology is necessary. What I should like to apologize for is the slovenliness of much of the writing. The circumstances under which the Charge was written are the cause, and I do not feel that I have succeeded in removing irregularities of expression in my revision.

I should like to express my thanks to Dr. Maynard Smith for his kindness in putting at my disposal and allowing me to publish the catena of passages of Anglican Divines of the sixteenth and seventeenth century on the position of the Church of England, especially in relation to the Church of Rome. Provided we do not allow ourselves to be controlled by it, a catena of passages is often of the greatest value. It makes clear to us both what the Church has agreed on and also—and that is most important—

what it has not agreed upon, and it prevents us from confusing the opinions of individual theologians with the common traditions of the Church. It enables us to distinguish the realities of the Anglican position from the one-sided opinion of different parties in the Church.

The purpose of this Charge has been twofold. On the one side to investigate and define the position of the Church of England, and on the other to give directions and advice to the Clergy of the Diocese on questions of doctrine, worship and policy which are before us at the present time. I have tried throughout to define the principles of Anglicanism as they have gradually formed themselves in history, and to treat the detailed problems in the light of these principles.

A. C. GLOUCESTER.

THE PALACE,
GLOUCESTER.
August 3, 1924.

NORWICH PUBLIC LIBRARIES

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION - - - - - *pages* 1-2

The special characteristics of the Church of England.
The purpose of this work.

CHAPTER I

THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH - - - - *pages* 3-24

The foundation of the Christian Church. The promise to St. Peter. Jesus and the Church.
The Church in History. The Divisions of the Church.
Theories as to the true Church.
The true doctrine of the Church. The teaching of the Church of England. Churchmen and Nonconformists.

CHAPTER II

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND: HOW IT CAME TO BE WHAT IT IS *pages* 25-47

1. The Anglo-Saxon Church. Its double origin. A National Church. Its interest in learning. A Church of the people. A Missionary Church. Its insularity.
2. The Mediæval Church. King and Pope. The decay of the Papacy. Wycliffe. The religion of the Middle Ages.
3. The Reformation. Its political causes. A national revolution. The power of tradition. Evangelical religion. The influence of Humanism.
4. The Church of the present day. Religious freedom. Comprehension. Movements of religious thought. The extension of the English Church. Its transformation.

CHAPTER III

THE DOCTRINAL TEACHING OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND *pages* 48-69

1. Our doctrinal Authority. Scripture. The Church. The Creeds. No infallibility. Christain Authority.
2. The Creed. The simplicity of the Faith. The Christology of Chalcedon. The Virgin Birth. The Atonement.
3. The Sacraments. Their importance. Mediæval Developments. The teaching of the English Church. Simplicity. Avoidance of definition. Not mechanical. Methods of teaching.

CHAPTER IV

THE WORSHIP OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND - *pages* 70-95

Mediæval Worship. The claim of the Church of England.

1. The principles of the Prayer Book. Loyalty to the Church. The authority of the Bishop. The tendencies in the Church. Variety in worship.
2. The Ornaments Rubric. The policy of Queen Elizabeth. The custom of the Church. The Episcopal dress.
3. The principal Morning Service. Mass and Communion. The Choral Eucharist. The duty of a Parish Priest.

CHAPTER V

THE WORSHIP OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND AND THE REVISION OF THE PRAYER BOOK - - - *pages* 96-110

1. Desire for definite direction. Confession. Fasting. Fasting Communion. Reservation. Church Music.
2. Prayer Book Revision. Reasons for it. The Revision of the Canon.

CHAPTER VI

THE ORGANIZATION OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND - *pages* 111-129

1. The value of organization.
2. The testimony of the New Testament. Limitations of its teaching.

3. Arguments for Episcopacy.

4. The teaching of the Church of England. Its moderation. Points of agreement. Points of difference. Relation to Protestant Churches.

5. The Apostolical Succession.

6. Changes in conception of Episcopal Office.

7. Resolutions regarding Ministry of Conference at Lambeth.

CHAPTER VII

THE CHURCH AND EDUCATION - - *pages* 130-153

Importance of Education.

1. History of Education in England. The work of the Church. Anglo-Saxon learning.

2. Education in the Middle Ages. The Mediæval University. Diffusion of Education. The Wycliffite Movement. The Gloucester School case.

3. The Renaissance and Reformation. The new learning. Influence of religious controversy. Control of education by the Church.

4. The Nineteenth Century. The new era. Education compulsory, national, bureaucratic, secular, democratic.

5. English Education. Danger of State control. Need of freedom in religion.

CHAPTER VIII

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND AND ITS RELATION TO OTHER RELIGIOUS BODIES - - - - *pages* 154-190

The divisions of Christianity. Their causes.

1. The Church of Rome. The Malines Conversations. The position of the Pope. Supremacy and Infallibility.

2. The Church of Rome. Doctrinal relations. Sacramental teaching. Nonconformist opinion.

3. The Church and Nonconformity. Recognition of Orders. Presbyterian view. Opinion of Swedish Church. Interest in Episcopacy.

4. The Church and Continental Protestantism. Relations to Lutheranism. Archbishop Söderblom.

5. Relations to the Eastern Church. The tragedy of Eastern Christianity. Honesty in our presentation.

CHAPTER IX

The Mission of the Church of England - *pages* 191-205

1. The Church of England National. Relation to the State. Appointment of Bishops. Freedom of the Church. Its International relations.

2. The Church of England and learning. Testimony of Archbishop Söderblom. Relation to the Universities.

3. Religious freedom and comprehensiveness. Value of free enquiry.

4. The Church of England and Reunion. Need of courage.

CHAPTER X

The English Cathedral: Episcopal Visitations *pages* 206-215

The purpose of a Visitation. The Authority of the Bishop. Record of Gloucester Visitations. Need for Visitations at the present day.

CHAPTER XI

The English Cathedral: Cathedral Reform *pages* 216-239

The good state of the Cathedral Church.

1. Relations of Bishop to the Cathedral. Authority of Charter and Statutes. The Cathedral the Bishop's Church and the Parish Church of the Diocese.

2. The position of Honorary Canons.

3. The publicity of the Visitation Court.

4. The Commission on Property and Finance. Its findings in relation to Cathedrals. Statutes obsolete and funds insufficient.

5. Lines of Reform. The work of a Cathedral. The position of the Bishop. The Dean. The Canons. The Honorary Canons. The Minor Canons. The Vergers. The Library. The King's School. The fabric.

APPENDIX

Selections from the writings of English Divines of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Century on the position of the Church of England, especially in relation to the Church of Rome, by the Rev. H. Maynard Smith, D.D., Canon of Gloucester.
pages 240-289

INDEX - - - - - - *pages* 291-296

NORWICH PUBLIC LIBRARIES

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

INTRODUCTION

THE Church of England occupies a somewhat special place among the different branches of the Christian Society. It has affinities with both the great schools of thought between which Christianity is held to be divided. While there are some of its members who would insist with great emphasis that it is Catholic, there are others who are equally certain that it is Protestant. From one point of view it is undoubtedly a National Church, but it clearly makes claims to present a type of Christianity which transcends national limits and competes for universal recognition. To some the Church of England is an irrational political compromise: to some it is a mere *via media*, a form of Christianity which has not the courage to call itself one thing or the other; to others, again, it represents more accurately than any other religious body the true tradition of primitive Christianity. A further characteristic of it is that it is difficult to define or describe. We know what Calvinism is; we find its tenets admirably put before us in the Institutes of Calvin. We know what Lutheranism is; it represents quite clearly the teaching of Luther. The Church of Rome has systematically defined and regulated its doctrine, its worship, and its law; but what is the teaching of the Church of England? There is no great theologian to whom we can appeal, and say, "Here you can find what we teach." To some this appears to be a grave defect. But others would claim that the religion of Christ is deeper and more profound than any one theologian can comprehend, and that a Church should aim at representing all the different

aspects of it. We are not limited by the teaching of one man, however admirable. The Church of England is undoubtedly comprehensive. Is this a serious defect or a real gain ?

I cannot but think that, especially in view of the discussions and the hopes of the present time, it will not be inappropriate if I devote my primary visitation charge to reviewing the history and purpose of the Church of England, to discussing its doctrine, its worship, and organization, to considering its relation to other religious bodies, and to attempting to outline its mission in the world.

CHAPTER I

THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH

We cannot describe accurately the Church of England unless we have first a clear idea of the Christian and Catholic Church of which it claims to be a part. I shall therefore devote the first section of my charge to the subject of the Christian Church.[1]

A belief in the Christian Church in some form or other has been a part of the teaching of almost all branches of Christianity. The only body which seems to be entirely without such a belief is the Quakers. But, although all have held some belief, it has taken very varied forms. Some have laid stress mainly on its being a visible organized society, and have attempted to define with accuracy the limits of that society; others have laid stress on the invisible Church, and have placed its unity in the mystical body of those who are true servants of Jesus Christ and are united by the spiritual bond of their life in Christ. These two conceptions have been combined in different ways. I propose first of all to ask what was the purpose of Christ; then to consider what have been the different forms that the Christian Church has presented; and, thirdly, to attempt to answer the question where it may be found.

What was our Lord's intention and purpose? Did He intend to combine His followers in a society? And did He give any directions as to what form that society should take?

We have to begin with an express declaration ascribed to Him—words spoken to St. Peter on a very memorable

[1] A good deal that is contained in this first section is based on what I have written in *The Doctrine of the Church and Christian Reunion* (London: John Murray. 1920). The evidence for much that I say here may be found in that work.

occasion. When St. Peter had definitely, on behalf of the disciples, confessed his belief that his Master was the Messiah, Jesus said to him: "And I also say unto thee, that thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build My Church; and the gates of Hades shall not prevail against it. I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven."[1]

The first difficulty we have with these words is that doubts have been expressed as to their genuineness; it has been maintained that they were added to the narrative at some later period—as late as the second century, it has been said—in the interests of party movements in the early Church. I have never been able to accept that solution. The opinion that we must form on a question such as this must depend partly on our general position with regard to questions of criticism. Now, all my studies have convinced me that the great bulk of the words ascribed to Jesus in the Synoptic Gospels must be genuine. They could not have come at a later date. They represent something which is behind the teaching of the Christian Church. Nor does the fact that these words occur only in the Gospel of St. Matthew interfere with that opinion. As far as I am able to judge, much of what is most characteristic and most far-reaching in its influence among the sayings of our Lord is reported by St. Matthew alone. Whether all these words were necessarily spoken at the same time is a more difficult question, as it is undoubtedly the habit of St. Matthew to group together sayings of our Lord derived from different sources, and belonging to different occasions according to their subject-matter.

I see no reason on general grounds to doubt the authenticity of these words. Nor on particular grounds are there any reasons, apart from *a priori* theories as to what our Lord ought to have said. It must be recognized that much of what is called criticism consists in first constructing a theory of what ought to have been the teaching of

[1] Matt. xvi. 18, 19.

Jesus, and then cutting out or rewriting such portions of the Gospel teaching as conflict with that reconstruction. This method is called by its adherents scientific. It is, of course, nothing of the sort.

There are various criteria by which we may judge the genuineness of a passage. One is language. Now, all the language of this passage is markedly Jewish in character. The address Simon Bar Jonah must have come from one who spoke in Aramaic. "Flesh and blood" is a normal Hebrew expression. So is "My Father which is in heaven." The metaphors of building the Church, of the gates of Hades, of the keys of the kingdom of heaven, are all Jewish. The phrase "binding and loosing" was regularly used of the authority of the Rabbis, and may be contrasted with the language of St. John's Gospel: "Whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained," which are probably a later paraphrase.[1] Then the word *ecclesia*. with its Hebrew and Aramaic equivalents, was used in the Old Testament of the Congregation of the Saints—that is, of the Assembly of Israel in its ideal aspect. So far as language goes, the passage must belong to the more primitive sections of the Gospel.[2]

Then as regards subject-matter. The position ascribed to St. Peter is in accordance with all our other evidence. In all lists of the Apostles he is put first and called "first." He is the leader of the Apostolic body. He becomes the leader of the Christian community after the death of Jesus. The natural deduction is that he held that position because he had been given it by his Master, and that these words record the commission. The perverted view is that this passage was forged in order to create or justify that position.

It is, of course, the use that is made of this passage to support the claims of the Church of Rome which has caused much of this criticism, and it is necessary, there-

[1] See p. 10.

[2] For illustrations of the language of this passage from Jewish sources, see Dalman, *Words of Jesus* (E. T.), p. 213.

fore, for us to determine what is the position that the promise of our Lord gave to St. Peter. At any rate, the suggestion that the passage was interpolated to support Roman claims is absurd, because it was already in the Gospels, and had, indeed, been commented upon and studied before these claims existed.

What is the position, then, that the promise gives to St. Peter? The answer must be one which is purely personal. Our Lord had selected him at the beginning of His ministry to be the leader of the Apostles. He now announces that he it is on whom He will build up the congregation of the Messiah, the new Israel. He did not desire, nor do the words imply that He desired, to confer any authority on any successor of St. Peter; nor were they originally taken in the Christian Church to have had any such meaning. For the correct way in which these words should be interpreted, I would refer you to the Dissertation on *St. Peter at Rome* which may be found in the second volume of Bishop Lightfoot's edition of *Clement of Rome*.[1] There are three main points to notice. The first is that the early Patristic commentators have no notion that these words implied that any particular position or authority was to be ascribed to St. Peter, or to any successor of his, much less to the Roman Church. Take the following passage of Origen:

" But if we also, like Peter, say, *Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God*, flesh and blood not having revealed it to us, but the Spirit from heaven having illumined our hearts, we become as Peter, and it would be said to us by the Word, *Thou art Peter*, and so forth. For every disciple of Christ is a rock, from which all they that partake of the spiritual rock which follows did drink; and upon every such rock the whole doctrine of the Church and the polity in accordance therewith is built. . . . But if thou supposest that the whole Church is built by God on that one Peter alone, what wouldest thou say concerning John the son of Thunder, or any one of the Apostles? Otherwise shall we dare to say that against

[1] Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, vol. i.; *Clement of Rome*, vol. ii., p. 481; *St. Peter in Rome*.

Peter especially the gates of hell shall not prevail, but that they shall prevail against the remaining Apostles? . . . Are, then, the keys of the kingdom of heaven given by the Lord to Peter alone, and shall none other of the blessed Apostles receive them? . . . Many, therefore, shall say to the Saviour, *Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God* . . . and if any saith this to Him, flesh and blood not revealing it, but the Father which is in heaven, he shall obtain the promises, as the letter of the Gospel says, to that particular Peter, but as the Spirit teaches, to every one who becomes like that Peter, 'For all became namesakes of the rock who are imitators of Christ the spiritual rock.' "[1]

Now the point is not whether this interpretation is correct, but that it would have been impossible for Origen to have written like this, if in his time there had been any idea that the promise of our Lord was made to the Bishops of Rome as successors of St. Peter.

As Bishop Lightfoot sums up the evidence:

" This with some modification is the universal interpretation of the fathers for many centuries with those few exceptions represented by St. Augustine's afterthoughts who explain it of Christ the Rock. They understand it to mean S. Peter's confession or S. Peter's faith or S. Peter's firmness. In other words, it is some quality or action in the Apostle at this crisis which calls forth the Lord's promise, and to which the same promise attaches wherever it is found in others. Thus Chrysostom says, and thus, again, Cyril of Alexandria."[2]

Now I would put it to you. Is it possible to believe that the words of our Lord implied the creation of a universal monarchy over the Christian Church when there was no knowledge of such an interpretation for many centuries, when no such rule or sovereignty existed, and the words were habitually interpreted in a different fashion?

The second point that I would have you notice is that

[1] Origen, *Comm. in Matt.* (xvi. 13), Tom. xii., § 10. I have taken both the quotation and translation from Lightfoot, *op. cit.*, p. 483.

[2] *Op. cit.*, p. 484.

the words have their natural and correct meaning in the actual position which St. Peter occupied, and was selected to occupy. I have elsewhere suggested that one of the reasons for our Lord's visit to Capernaum was that He might summon to Himself the disciples whom He needed.[1] If, as I believe, He had known Peter as a disciple of the Baptist, He would have known his character and, whatever element of weakness there might have been in him, He would have known that St. Peter was the man whom He needed for His work. So He chose him as the leader of His disciples, and that was the position that he occupied throughout the lifetime of Jesus. Peter was a man of impulse, and enthusiasm and power, yet there was an element of weakness in his character. Yet the strength always overpowered the weakness. As the first of the disciples during the lifetime of his Master, he quite naturally becomes the leader after His death. He asserts his primacy in the history of the infant Church. He is represented as taking the lead in the early chapters of the Acts of the Apostles; he takes the lead when the Gospel spreads to the Samaritans; he takes the lead in the extension of the Gospel to the Gentiles.[2] Then, when the foundations were laid, his prominence begins to cease. St. Paul became more important, many hands build up the Church, and because the Church is not to be an earthly sovereignty or monarchy, no supreme ruler in it is required, and the methods by which Christianity developed are quite different from what they would have been had there been any single authority exercising any sort of power over it.

Then, as a third point, I would have you notice how later, when the Church of Rome had gradually attained from various causes a prominent position and, urged by motives, some good, some less satisfactory, had begun to seek supremacy, the passage which referred to St. Peter began to be interpreted as referring to that aim, and certainly was very effective for that purpose; but this had not been the meaning assigned to it previously.

[1] *Life of Jesus the Christ*, p. 175. [2] See Lightfoot, *op. cit.*, p. 488.

It was not originally the words of the Gospels which suggested or built up the power of the Bishops of Rome and the See of Peter, but the growth of the power and claims of Rome which gave a new and incorrect meaning to these verses. At the beginning, indeed, the name of Paul was as important or more important than that of Peter as the founder of the Roman Church. Of course, later, when the promise made to Peter had been transferred to the Church of Rome, it gave what seemed to be a Scriptural authority for the claims of that Church, and its importance for those who accept this interpretation is very great at the present day.

There is one more verse that we have to study, that which contains the promise of "binding and loosing." This verse is contained also in the other passage in St. Matthew's Gospel which refers to the Church. "And if thy brother sin against thee, go, show him his fault between thee and him alone: if he hear thee, thou hast gained thy brother. But if he hear thee not, take with thee one or two more, that at the mouth of two witnesses, or three, every word may be established. And if he refuse to hear them, tell it unto the church: and if he refuse to hear the church also, let him be unto thee as the Gentile and the publican. Verily I say unto you, What things soever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and what things soever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven."[1]

Here the words are apparently addressed to the disciples, an ambiguous expression, for we do not know whether it means the Twelve only, or the whole body of the disciples. It has, however, been pointed out that the very fact that this ambiguous term is used implies that the reference was not specifically to the Twelve, that the words were addressed to the disciples, whether a small number or large, as the representatives of the Church.[2]

[1] Matt. xviii. 15-18.

[2] See Hort, *The Christian Ecclesia*, p. 29: "Discipleship, not apostleship, was the primary active function, so to speak, of the Twelve till the Ascension."

The expression "binding and loosing" meant the authority to make decisions. As Dalman points out, of the law, who pronounces something as 'bound,' "these are the technical terms for the verdict of a doctor that is 'forbidden,' or else as 'loosed,' that is permitted—not, of course, in virtue of his own absolute authority, but in conformity with his knowledge of the oral law. Consequently the statement of Jesus would mean that His disciples—in virtue of their knowledge of His oral teaching—will be able to give an authoritative decision in regard to what the adherents of the theocracy may do and may not do."[1]

And then further:

"Peter has the keys of the theocracy, and as keeper of the keys is the fully authorized steward of the house of God upon earth. Since, moreover, it is the community of Jesus that is here concerned, in which Peter is to exercise this office, and as no sort of limitation to a defined sphere is indicated, it follows necessarily that the control of teaching and of discipline are entrusted to him. Peter had just shown that he understood his Master better than the others. He, therefore, shall it be, who will one day assume in the fellowship that position which Jesus then occupied in relation to His disciples. Again in Matt. xviii. 18 the same plenary power is vested in the disciples collectively, in the case when the special application of that authority is made in respect of the discipline of the community. Accordingly, the application which is given in John xx. 23 to this saying is not unwarranted. For exclusion from the community on account of some offence includes the 'retaining' of the sins : the readmission of the sinner includes the remission of his sins."[2]

To sum up, then. The passages of St. Matthew tell us that Jesus stated definitely that His purpose was to build up what He describes as His *ecclesia* or congregation, as we translate it "Church," using a word which, in the Old Testament and in contemporary writings, was employed to designate the ideal Assembly of the people

[1] Dalman, *op. cit.*, p. 214. [2] *Op. cit.*, p. 216.

of Israel; that He had selected St. Peter as one of enthusiasm, loyalty, and spiritual power to be the man through whose power of initiative He would begin this work; that whatever forces of evil might arise in the world and attack it, they would never ultimately prevail against it; and that Peter and the disciples generally, who for the time are the representatives of the new community, are to have powers of legislation and discipline in this community.

Now does this accord with our other information? I would represent to you that it harmonizes with the words and actions of Jesus, and corresponds exactly with the recorded course of events. I do not propose to prove this at great length here, as I have already discussed the general teaching of Jesus about the Christian Society somewhat fully. I would only point out to you that, in announcing the coming of the Kingdom, Jesus must have looked forward to the transformation of the imperfect Jewish community into the Kingdom of the Messiah. His conceptions and ideals so far transcended everything which Judaism had conceived, that He naturally spoke of it under the metaphors of new wine in new bottles, and of new garments; but all the terms which in the Old Testament were applied to the old community came to be applied to the new community. The divine theocracy of the prophets was realized in the Christian *ecclesia*. And Jesus' actions had prepared for this, and had been inspired by this purpose. He appointed the twelve Apostles with Peter at their head to be the leaders or ministers of this new community, which yet was old. He gathered together disciples. He united His followers together as a brotherhood. He foretold the Kingdom, and He went up to Jerusalem to appear as Messiah and to inaugurate the new society, knowing that He would found it in His death.

Then all things happened as He had purposed. The gift of the Spirit comes. The Church which represents the Kingdom or the People of God is built up on the labours of the Apostles with Peter at their head. A nucleus was formed by the faithful disciples. They are

spoken of as "the brothers." Very early the legislation and the discipline necessary for the infant Church began. The new society which was the transformation of the old grew and developed. We need not pursue the history in detail. The development is one both of external extension and of the internal growth rendered necessary by the extension. The appointment of the Seven; the establishment of a regular method of ordination by the laying on of hands; the spread from Jerusalem; the separation from the synagogue; the organization of Christian *synagogai* or, as they came to be called, *ecclesiai*, with their presbyters; the rise of the evangelistic ministry of apostles, evangelists, prophets, and teachers; the extension of the Gospel to Samaritans, to Gentiles in the Holy Land, to the Gentile world, to Antioch, to Ephesus, to Corinth, and Rome; the passing away of the missionary ministry, and the establishment, however it happened, of monarchical episcopacy—all these are landmarks in the progress of the new society.

The point that I would make is that none of these things happened, so far as we can judge, in accordance with any command or direction of Jesus; they were the natural outcome of the spiritual power and life of the Church moulding itself to the different circumstances that arose. I would quote what Dr. Hort has said about the appointment of the Seven:

"But the appointment was not only a notable recognition of the Hellenistic element in the Ecclesia at Jerusalem, a prelude of greater events to come, but also a sign that the Ecclesia was to be an Ecclesia indeed, not a mere horde of men ruled absolutely by the Apostles, but a true body politic, in which different functions were assigned to different members, and a share of responsibility rested upon the members at large, each and all; while every work for the Ecclesia, high and low, was of the nature of a 'ministration,' a true rendering of a servant's service."[1]

There are certain great principles that emerge from a study of our Lord's method in founding the Church

[1] Hort, *op. cit.*, p. 52.

and the history of its development. He never gave rules or laws for His Church. He gave great ethical principles, which were universal in their application. He attached men to Himself by personal allegiance, by love and faith, and thus made Himself the centre of the new society, but He formulated no dogmatic principles. He did not give a constitution, but He established the principles on which a society might develop brotherhood, discipleship, ministry, the Sacraments. He left the Church to organize its own form and order. So, again, with the Apostolic Church. It inherited these principles. In accordance with them it developed. It gradually built up a polity. We can study its methods. We can learn its customs. But it never gave us any regulations for the future. The government of the Church in the Apostolic age was different from what it became afterwards. I am quite willing to call the Bishops the successors of the Apostles, and to look upon Episcopacy as a wholesome representation for us of the polity of the Apostolic age, but we have no Apostolic command giving any authority to Episcopacy as we know it. The history of the Church has been, and should be, a free development of the principles that Jesus gave it.

I pass on to the Christian Church in history. This history divides itself, from our present point of view, into three epochs.

The first is the period of the Undivided Church, which lasted for just a thousand years. It was in 1054 that the final breach occurred between East and West, and the great schism began. The second period lasted from the time of the schism to the Reformation. It came to an end when Luther, in 1517, nailed his theses on the church door at Wittenberg. It was the period of the mediæval papacy and the division of East and West. The third period has extended from the Reformation to the present day. It is the period of a divided Christianity.

Now, as a result of this history, from causes which I have attempted to analyze elsewhere, the one Church

which existed thus for the first thousand years of Christianity has become divided. There are a considerable number of large religious bodies, and a large number of smaller ones, all competing against one another, and presenting a very diversified and irregular appearance. Now, to the disinterested observer, surveying all these from outside, a problem of intense interest arises—Where does the true Church lie? What is true Christianity? The question, indeed, does not present itself very acutely to most of us. We have received our Christianity within a particular religious body, and have what appears to be a fairly satisfactory solution, at any rate one to which we are accustomed. But to some men, at some periods, the question which is the true Church has assumed such importance, that it has demanded from them the sacrifice of their lives, and it is obvious that if we are to teach Christianity as a true explanation of human life and the problems of the world, we must do our best to be certain what that Christianity is. At the present day both these problems are insistent, for the world is beginning to be dissatisfied with a Christianity which speaks with a divided voice, and as systems of doctrine have been put forward claiming to represent Christianity which seem to many certainly untrue, it becomes of obvious importance for those who advocate it to have examined carefully the teaching that they give, and to satisfy themselves that it is true. It is a much better attitude of mind and thought for you to adopt, to ask yourself whether what you teach is really true, than to ask, How can I defend what I am teaching? Honest investigation is the best apologetic.

Let us consider some of the main theories which are presented to us. There are those in the first place who claim that the church or society to which they belong is the true Church, and that there is none other, and that all outside it are outside the Church. This is the claim often made by the Roman Church, and sometimes asserted most aggressively. At other times, the crudity of the claim becomes too apparent, and it is modified in various

ways. A distinction is made between the soul and body of the Church, and it is allowed that those who do not belong to the body may belong to the soul. The metaphor has never seemed to me to be a happy one, but it is interesting as exhibiting a method of escaping from a dogmatic position which is too obviously impossible. A similar claim is made theoretically by the Orthodox Eastern Church, but never, I think, quite seriously. There are also, I believe, some Protestant bodies who have held it. Then there are those bodies which have put forward certain conditions, the fulfilment of which is necessary to constitute a true Church. The most typical of these is the Anglo-Catholic theory that the essential thing is the possession of the threefold ministry of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, and a valid ministry assured by the possession of Apostolic succession. A modification of this theory is now held by some. It demands that a Church, if it is to be Catholic, must teach everything which the undivided Church taught. It would, therefore, approximate more closely to the position of the Eastern Church—as the Church of the Seven Sacraments and the Seven Councils—and then would represent this as the teaching of the Church of England. As a counterpart to the theory of a universal Episcopacy, there is a certain tendency to develop a system of Pan-Presbyterianism. Then there are those who would divide the Christian world into Catholic and Protestant, and consider that truth should be found only among those who are Protestants, meaning by that those who accept, as the basis of their faith, the Bible and the Bible only. Or they would put forward a particular exposition of Christianity which is called the Gospel, and would say that the true Church consists of all those that preach the Gospel. While the tendency of one side is to lay particular stress on the visible Church, and therefore on external signs, such as ministry and sacraments, the tendency of others is to be indifferent to such outward characteristics. Some form of organization may be found useful, but the essential thing is the

possession of Evangelical truth. Such an attitude would be represented by the World Evangelical Alliance.

Now what is the criterion by which we are able to judge these different bodies or theories? The difficulty is that each of them puts forward its own standard of truth, and then claims to be true because it conforms to the standard that it has itself erected. One would maintain that the Bible was a sufficient source of truth. Another would remind us that the Bible was given us by the Church, and therefore it was for the Church to tell us what the Bible means; or, again, we are reminded that the Church is inspired by the Holy Spirit, and that therefore there will be found to be development in the teaching of the Church. Some would appeal to reason as our authority, and forget that reason really depends for its conclusions on the premises with which it starts. We find ourselves in the old dilemma. It is easy, if you have settled your standard of truth, to show that certain opinions conform to that standard, but it is much harder to start without any presuppositions, and then find your way through this tangled skein, and create for yourselves a satisfactory theory of what is really true.

I think, however, that as we are approaching the subject from the point of view of the Church of England, we may be excused from making the very elaborate investigations which would be necessary if we had no presuppositions, and investigate the matter from our standpoint, and it is possible that the point of view that we attain may be one which we shall not shrink from putting forward for more general acceptance. Now we have a very good starting-point. We are agreed that "Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation: so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an article of the Faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation." What, then, may be gathered from the Scripture that is from the teaching of our Lord and His Apostles as to the essential characteristics of the Christian Church?

It will, I think, be found that while we can deduce from Scripture certain broad principles, it is difficult to discover any detailed directions which might enable us to fix the notes of the Church. We begin with the question of belief. Quite certainly the Church is the Church of Christ, and we should believe in Him and the revelation through Him. And the Church is Apostolic; it is built upon the foundations of the Apostles and Prophets; we should, like the Church of the first days, continue stedfast in the Apostles' doctrine and fellowship. We ask, then, what on this basis is the belief necessary for membership of the Church, and we find that it is simple. St. Paul tells us: "If thou shalt confess with thy mouth Jesus as Lord, and shalt believe in thy heart that God raised Him from the dead, thou shalt be saved."[1] "Believe on the Lord Jesus, and thou shalt be saved."[2] Belief in Jesus Christ and the fundamental facts recorded of Him is what is necessary. Now I do not mean that this limits our teaching, nor that the Church should not expand its teaching in a full and complete manner, but Scripture has been careful not to confuse the fuller exposition of truth with that confession of faith in Jesus which is a condition of salvation, and therefore of Church membership.

Or we turn to the ordinances of the Church. The duty of baptism is clear and definite: "Except a man be born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven."[3] And all Apostolic practice and precept harmonize with this injunction. We may reasonably conclude that the Church must obey its Master's command in the institution of the Eucharist, and again we have sufficient support in the practice of the Apostolic Church. I do not think that we can doubt that the two Sacraments of Baptism and the Holy Communion are essential, and that we should follow the command of our Master and the example of the Apostles in administering them. But I do not find any Scriptural evidence for a necessary doctrine of the Eucharist. There are other

[1] Rom. x. 9. [2] Acts xvi. 31. [3] John iii. 5.

ordinances for which support may be found in the New Testament, and it may be quite right for a Church to build up a wholesome system of life and worship, but there is no evidence for anything else as a necessary mark of the Church.

What should be the ministry of the Church? Our Lord appointed His Apostles, and we find them exercising the functions of ministers during the Apostolic age, and appointing others to exercise a ministry in the Church. We are particularly told that Christ "gave some to be apostles; and some prophets; and some evangelists; and some pastors and teachers; for the perfecting of the saints, unto the work of ministering, unto the building up of the body of Christ."[1] A properly appointed and regular ministry must be characteristic of the Church, and may claim to have the authority of Christ. But when we ask for any directions as to what the ministry should be, we find no command either of our Lord or of the Apostles, and, as a matter of fact, no ministry of the present day corresponds exactly with the ministry of Apostolic times. It may be reasonable to argue that we ought to ordain our ministers by laying on of hands with prayer as the Apostles did, but no injunction is given which we should be bound to follow. Now I do not wish to argue that it is not right for the Church to lay down for itself a rule of orders, and build up a ministry, and that we should not adhere to its rule; but that is something different from saying that a particular form of Church government is a necessary mark of the Church, and that we are justified in saying that religious bodies which exhibit the faith and life of Christianity are outside the Church because they have not an episcopal Church order.

The real fact we have to remember is that, if we study the New Testament, we find far more stress laid on the Christian life than on external form. Our Lord Himself says, "By their fruits ye shall know them,"[2] and puts that forward as the test by which we are to distinguish between a true and a false prophet. It is faith, and charity,

[1] Eph. iv. 11, 12. [2] Matt. vii. 20.

and holiness that are dwelt on, and these are the true notes of the Church.

I would suggest to you, therefore, that the varied and often singularly exact criteria so often put forward for determining what is the true Church have no real authority for us. We look out on the world and see many religious bodies, some large, some small, professing the name of Christ. We find that all alike believe in the Lord Jesus, although some may have a less intelligent belief than others. We find that all aim, however imperfect may be their performance, at fulfilling His commands and at living a Christian life. We find that with a few exceptions and some irregularity they accept the Sacrament of Baptism and the Lord's Supper. Almost all of them have produced, and do produce, striking examples of Christian piety and holiness. This is as true of Wesleyan, or Lutheran, or Calvinist, as of the Church of Rome. I do not find any principle on which we can rule any of these bodies outside the Church, even if we find in them serious imperfections.

But there is another note of the Church which we can certainly gather from the New Testament. It is unity. The Church is to be one, and that means quite definitely a visible bodily unity—a unity of such a character that it enables all members of the Church to be called brothers, and to be bound together as brothers. Now, of course, if there are two or more separate bodies of Christians the unity is broken, and neither can claim to be the one Church. If, indeed, there were one body which could prove quite clearly that on every point it was right and that it had never been guilty of any conduct or teaching which had caused a breach of unity, then it might claim to be the true Church. That is the claim which the Church of Rome makes, but to most of us it seems ludicrous and impertinent. It asserts that the Bishop of Rome is infallible. To most of us that claim is so contrary to fact, that it is sufficient, apart from other reasons, to condemn it. If we examine history, it appears that again and again it is the intolerant attitude of the Church

of Rome which has caused schism. In fact, it is the unwarranted claims of the Roman Church which are the chief cause of the present divided state of Christianity. Nor is it easier to accept the claims of the Orthodox Eastern Church to be the one true Church. Its claim to infallibility is as little justifiable, and we cannot hold it free from responsibility in the matter of disunion, even if we recognize that fundamentally its refusal to submit to the claims of Rome was right.

There is really no church which can justify its claim to be the one true Church. The very fact of our separateness is a sign of our deficiency, and when we look back in history it is difficult to free any church from blame. I have argued elsewhere that all the separated branches of Christ's Church ought, if we used correct language, to be described as "schisms," and not as churches. The guilt is shared by all—by some, no doubt, more, by others less—but none of us are free from reproach. Above all, that Church which makes the most dogmatic pretensions to be the true Church—the Church of Rome—has been continuously the cause of schism. By putting forth as necessary to salvation what is contrary to Scripture; by a narrow, intolerant, and uncharitable policy, it has again and again caused dissension in the Church, and its claims at the present day are the greatest obstacle to Christian unity.

In place, then, of any theory which lays down definite and narrow distinctions for determining who belongs to the Christian Church, I would suggest this to you. The Church on earth consists of all those who have accepted the faith of Christ, been baptized into Christ, and attempt to live according to His will. And these Christians ought to be united in one visible society, which should be apostolic in its teaching and order, holy in its life, and universal in the sphere of its work. That Church is the true Church, the body of Christ, but it exists only as an ideal unity. As an actual fact, owing to the sins and imperfections of mankind, it is divided into many different bodies. All these different branches represent, some of

them more, some of them less, imperfectly the ideal of a true Church. It is the bounden duty of every Christian to make his church as far as possible a perfect church, especially in its exposition of Christian faith and charity, and to do all that he can to break down the barriers which separate church and church, and thus promote Christian unity.

Now, as regards this theory, I would suggest to you that it is that of the Church of England. It seems implied in the words: "More especially, we pray for the good estate of the Catholic Church: that it may be so guided and governed by Thy good Spirit, that all who profess and call themselves Christians may be led into the way of truth and hold the faith in unity of spirit, in the bond of peace, and in righteousness of life." It seems still more clear in the Bidding prayer, in the form in which it is generally used: "Let us pray for Christ's Holy Catholic Church—that is, for the whole congregation of Christian people dispersed throughout the world." The Article may be held to be more ambiguous, for it is capable of a narrower and a broader interpretation: "The visible Church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men, in the which the pure Word of God is preached, and the Sacraments be duly administered according to Christ's ordinance in all things that of necessity are requisite to the same." Anyone who believed that an episcopally ordained minister was necessary to the due celebration of the Sacrament, might hold that this Article excluded from the Church all those bodies which are without a duly consecrated episcopate. But I do not think that is its meaning, for no ordinance of Christ can be found in favour of episcopacy, and it is to Christ's ordinance that the Article appeals.

Then, secondly, I believe that the theory I have suggested harmonizes with the actual facts of religious life. Any theory which ruled out of the Church the great body of Protestant Nonconformists, or Continental Protestants, must be untrue. We may quite well hold that in some things they are defective. That is another matter. Any

NORWICH PUBLIC LIBRARIES

theory, again, which said that all religious bodies were equally good, and that it makes no difference to which a man belongs, must be untrue. Any theory which did not put prominently forward the duty of Christians to promote Christian unity would be untrue to Christ's purpose.

Then, thirdly, it is this theory which has been accepted and agreed upon in the Conferences which have been taking place between Churchmen and Nonconformists with a view to Christian unity. The report states it so admirably that I will quote it in full.

On the Nature of the Church.

1. The foundation of the Church rests not upon the will or consent or beliefs of men, whether as individuals or as societies, but upon the creative Will of God.

2. The Church is the Body of Christ, and its constitutive principle is Christ Himself, living in His members through His Spirit.

3. As there is but one Christ, and one Life in Him, so there is and can be but one Church.

4. This one Church consists of all those who have been, or are being, redeemed by and in Christ, whether in this world or in the world beyond our sight, but it has its expression in this world in a visible form. Yet the Church, as invisible and as visible, is, by virtue of its one life in Christ, one.

5. This visible Church was instituted by Christ as a fellowship of men united with Him, and in Him with one another, to be His witness and His instrument in the spread of His Kingdom on earth.

6. As a visible Church it must possess certain visible and recognizable marks whereby it can be seen and known by men. These have been, since the days of the Apostles at least, the following: (*a*) The profession of faith in God as revealed and incarnate in Christ; (*b*) the observance of the two Sacraments ordained by Christ Himself; (*c*) an ideal of the Christian life protected by a common discipline; (*d*) a ministry, representative of the Church, for the preaching of the word, the administration

of the Sacraments, and the maintenance of the unity and continuity of the Church's witness and work.

7. Baptism is by the ordinance of Christ and of His Apostles the outward and visible sign of admission into membership of the Church.

8. The Church visible on earth ought to express and manifest to the world by its own visible unity the one Life in Christ of the one Body.

9. The true relation of the Church and local Churches is that which is described in the New Testament—namely, that the Churches are the local representatives of the One Church. The actual situation brought about in the course of history, in which there are different and even rival denominational Churches independent of each other and existing together in the same locality, whatever justification arising out of historical circumstances may be claimed for these temporary separations, cannot be regarded as in accordance with the Purpose of Christ, and every endeavour ought to be made to restore the true position as set forth in the New Testament.

10. The marks which ought to characterize the Church visible on earth are possessed by these existing separate Churches and societies of Christian people in very varying degrees of completeness or defect. Hence, even though they be parts of the visible Church, they cannot be considered as all alike, giving equally adequate expression to the Lord's Mind and Purpose. Some, indeed, may be so defective that they cannot rightly be judged to be parts of that Church. But such judgments, though made in trust that they are in accordance with the Divine Mind, must be regarded as limited to the sphere of the visible Church as an ordered society here on earth. It would be presumption to claim that they have a like validity in the sphere of the whole Church as the One Body of the redeemed in Christ, for within that sphere judgment can only be given by the All-knowing Mind and Sovereign Mercy of God.

Now from this theory of the Church, in relation to the facts of the present day, two deductions may be made.

The first is this, that when we are considering the Church of England, we need not be too careful to prove

that it is part of the true Church. It certainly is that. We should rather be anxious to ask ourselves: In what way is it imperfect? How far does it come short of its ideal? In what way can we best correct, reform, or beautify our Church? What can we learn from other religious bodies?

And then, next, we must avoid presenting ourselves to the world, or in any way claim to be "the Church." We must not go to other Christian societies and say: "We are the Church; you are schismatics, come into us." We know how offensive and ridiculous it appears to us when the controversialists of the Roman Church come to us and say: "We are the true and only Church; to us you must come; with us alone is salvation." It is obvious that that is a claim which does not harmonize with reality. We must be equally careful that we do not act as offensively and ridiculously ourselves. But we do so if we go to the Nonconformist Churches and say: "We are the Church, and you are outside it." If the Scottish Episcopal Church says to the Presbyterians of Scotland, "We are the true Church, you are not the Church," they are making themselves ridiculous. Rather we should say: "We are all imperfect representations of that Church which should be one." That Church, through faults which are partly ours, is divided; through prejudices in which we share, fails to come together. We may rightly believe that we have something to contribute to the common unity. We may quite justly be ready to defend our practices and ways, but we must make no claim to superiority. Whenever the Christian minister adopts the line of the master and the superior, he is departing from the example of Christ. We should be loyal to our own Church, but we should combine that loyality with a passion for truth, with a readiness to learn, and with wide human sympathies.

The Church of England has learnt much in the last hundred years. It has also taught much. It has, I think, more to teach, but it can only teach if it is always learning.

CHAPTER II

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND: HOW IT CAME TO BE WHAT IT IS

I PROPOSE to discuss with you to-day the Church of England, and to attempt to discover how it came to be what it is. I have already pointed out that it has certain features which separate it from other religious bodies; that it is not altogether easy to understand; and that it has various elements in it which to some appear to be inconsistent with one another. To understand it properly, we must start with its history, and I propose to say something about the Anglo-Saxon Church, the Mediæval Church, the Church of the Reformation (including under that heading the whole period until the final settlement at the Restoration), and then the Church of our own time.[1]

I

The first period, the period of the Anglo-Saxon Church, ends just at the time when the final division took place between East and West. We have, therefore, to think of the English Church of that period as being part of an undivided Universal Church, and we have an interesting reminder of that in the fact that one of the greatest of the early Archbishops of Canterbury was Theodore of Tarsus, a Greek, to whom this Church and country owe the first systematic organization of its religious life.

The main characteristics of the English Church of the earliest period seem to me to have been as follows:

First of all, it was a Church with a double origin. While we owe our organization to the mission of St.

[1] I have not thought it necessary to give any detailed references in this chapter. I am dealing with well-known facts, such as may be found in any Church History.

Augustine, sent by the Church of Rome, a large part of the evangelization of the country was the work of missionaries from Scotland, and ultimately from Ireland. I can remember the time some years ago when it was the custom to lay great stress, perhaps an exaggerated stress, on the Celtic Mission. It was relied upon as an argument for the independence of the Church of England as against the Church of Rome. Now I notice a tendency to reaction; it has become customary to ignore very largely the work of the Scotch missionaries. I am afraid, as a North-countryman, I cannot acquiesce in the tendency to ignore their work, nor can I think it of little importance. Nor, I think, can the Church of Gloucester, linked as it has been with Northumbrian Christianity, forget this element in our history. The two types of Christianity which came in, one from the north, the other from the south, were different. The mission from the south linked the country up with the civilized world of the time. It brought it in contact with learning, and it gave, what was much needed, organization and discipline. But the Celtic Mission brought a more sincere and simple religious faith, and a keener insight into spiritual things. The combination of these two elements in our national history is one the influence of which we feel at the present day.

In the second place, the early English Church came to be in a marked way a National Church. The building up of Christianity in the country was, from the beginning, largely the work of Kings, and some of the most attractive and greatest names in early English Church history are those of Kings, Oswald and Alfred, to take two of the most conspicuous instances. It has often been pointed out that the unity of the Church preceded the unity of the Nation, and that the unified Church organization introduced by Theodore was one of the potent elements which helped in building up the unified national life. When once there was one Church, it became easy for there to be one Nation. But in other ways, too, the Church was very closely connected with the national

life. It was always difficult to distinguish what was secular and what was ecclesiastical. The laws of Alfred began with the Ten Commandments. There was not, till the time of William the Conqueror, any clear distinction between Secular and Ecclesiastical Courts. Though there were Councils of the Church, yet again and again ecclesiastical affairs were discussed at the Councils of the Nation. The King and his Witan had a large share in the appointment of Bishops, and Bishops were often associated very closely in the work of the State. It has been pointed out that this "weakened its spiritual life, tended to make its ministers worldly, and finally caused it to share in the national exhaustion and decline of the last years of the native monarchy. On the other hand, this union strengthened its hold on the national life and the affections of the people."[1] I cannot but think that this intimate union of Church and State has been an element which has persisted all through our history, and has helped largely to explain some of the characteristics of the Church of England at the present day.

Then, thirdly, almost from its origin, the English Church was conspicuous for its strong interest in learning. In the south, Hadrian and Theodore brought many books from Rome, and established a school at Canterbury, From there learning spread to the West Saxon Church, and under Aldhelm Malmesbury became the centre of the culture of the time. In the north, the Northumbrian Church inherited what learning the Celtic Church had possessed, and it was the Irish script which became the foundation of the English handwriting, and Irish ornament which beautified the English manuscripts. But it was Benedict Biscop who, in repeated journeys to Rome, brought to his monastery at Wearmouth great stores of books, and enabled Bede for a time to make this country conspicuous in the learned world of the day. England sent manuscripts to Rome in return for what it had

[1] Hunt, *The English Church from its Foundation to the Norman Conquest*, p. 414.

received, and in the writings of Bede there was an interesting combination of the desire to collect for the benefit of his fellow-countrymen all that he could of the learning of the time, and a patriotic desire to preserve the records of the English Church and people. Among Bede's pupils was Egbert, Archbishop of York, who founded the School of York, and from York went forth Alcuin to carry on to the Continent the traditions of English learning and preside over the Schools of Charlemagne.

But all this promise and fruition of learning were destroyed by the great cataclysm of the Danish invasion. The monks of St. Cuthbert had to wander with the precious possession of his body. Many monasteries throughout the country were totally destroyed. Even when the monasteries were still standing there were none left to read what books remained, and traditions of learning were largely lost.

But some revival came with Alfred. A student and a patron of learning, by his translations he brought foreign learning to the service of his people. His Chronicle laid the foundation of secular English History. The Danish invasions had almost extinguished learning in England. The deterioration of the Church was checked by his example, and the partial revival which ended the Anglo-Saxon period was largely the result of his work.

Fourthly, from the beginning the Church was very definitely a Church of the people, and one which developed a real popular religion. The example of Cædmon, who may be rather a name given to a collection of writings, shows us how the teaching of Christianity was expressed in popular songs and poems which might bring it home to the people, and would be sung at village feasts. We know how, at the time when he died, Bede himself was engaged upon a translation of St. John into the vernacular. It was the work of Alfred to translate into the tongue of his people books which might give them an introduction to religious and secular knowledge. At a later date Dunstan and Oswald, the great Bishop of Worcester,

and other leading Bishops, were known as popular preachers, and there have been preserved to us collections of homilies in the English language to enable the clergy to instruct their people. All through the history of England we shall find evidences of this desire for a simple popular religion, and this influence has had its effect in moulding the character of the English Church at the present time.

Fifthly, it was a missionary Church. It inherited this missionary enterprise and spirit of adventure from the Celtic Church, but the Englishman has always combined a love of adventure with his love of home, and it was natural that when England became Christian, English people should become missionaries. The earliest record we have is the mission of Wilfrid among the Frisians. Then came Willibrord, who followed in his steps, and was consecrated Archbishop. Companions of his carried his work on. But the greatest of the names of these early missionaries was Boniface, the "Apostle of Germany." He was accompanied by a body of English workers, who became Bishops set over monasteries, and at the end of his life, on June 5, 755, he was martyred. "As a missionary," we are told, "he was courageous and indefatigable; as a prelate, skilful in organization and firm of purpose. The oath of obedience which he took to the Roman See was strongly expressed and unreserved, and as the founder and first spiritual ruler of the German Church, he brought it into close connection with the Papacy. Apart from any consideration of the effects which the relation thus created with Rome may have had upon the course of German history in later ages, his action in this respect gave the Church which he created a standard of orthodox faith and practice, and prevented it from becoming a mere handmaid to the Carolingian House. To the English Church he was ever a loving and dutiful son; he watched its fortunes with anxiety, and looked to its Bishops and Councils for advice; he was cheered by the sympathy and strengthened by the prayers of its members, and was nobly supported by the devotion of those

whom it sent to help him in his work."[1] At a later date we hear of English missions in Scandinavia. It was part of the policy of Canute to use the zeal of the Englishmen to complete the conversion of the Danes, and he seems to have had a design to give the See of Canterbury some superiority over the Church in Denmark.

Then, lastly, the Church of England was, to a certain extent, an insular Church. As the present Bishop of Truro says: "In such matters as the relation of the Church to the State, of the Ecclesiastical law to the Civil law, and the Church as a whole to the Papacy, it remains insular and peculiar."[2] As regards its relation to the See of Rome, this insularity must not be exaggerated. From the beginning the English Church recognized what it owed to the mission of St. Augustine, and to the interests taken in its development by Gregory the Great and his successors. Rome to England represented not only the centre of ecclesiastical life, but also the home of learning and civilization, and all the great men of the English Church, especially in its early days, went to Rome to learn and to receive from it what it could teach. There was something like an English College in Rome, and it is known that many Anglo-Saxon coins have been found there. Its Archbishops regularly went to Rome to receive the Pall, and a journey to Rome in those days was often a dangerous undertaking.

But side by side with this there was a good deal of independence or insularity. The Church of Rome had interfered little with the affairs of the Church of England, and did not probably interest itself in them very much. Only twice do we hear of legates coming to England, once in the time of Offa, and then again just before the Norman Conquest.[3] There are one or two Papal letters dealing

[1] Hunt, *op. cit.*, pp. 219, 220.

[2] *Visitation Articles and Injunctions*, edited by Walter Howard Frere, D.D., vol. i., p. 47.

[3] See Hunt, *op. cit.*, pp. 236-240, 414: "While it regarded the Roman See with gratitude and reverence, it seldom either sought or accepted guidance from Rome. Twice only since the coming of Theodore had legates interfered in its affairs: the papal

with this country, but generally the Church of England managed its own affairs and did not pay much attention to Papal directions, and did not care about them. There was a gain in some directions in this insularity, but there was some loss also, and particularly in later days. When England was rather cut off from the religious reform movements on the Continent, its spiritual life suffered. Dunstan was inspired in his monastic reforms by his visits to France, and the Norman Ecclesiastics whom Edward the Confessor brought into the country represented, in some ways, a higher type of Church life.

To sum up, then: already in Anglo-Saxon times we find many of the characteristics which have marked the English Church since then, and the root of much that we shall find in its later history.

II

We pass now to the mediæval period, which extends from the year 1066 to the beginning of the Reformation in England with the anti-Papal legislation of Henry VIII.[1] It is a period of nearly 500 years, and divides itself roughly into two. The first includes the years up to 1300; it represents the best period of mediæval life when the Papacy was continually extending its power, largely because it represented the most vigorous spiritual life of Christendom. The second period was that of the decay of the mediæval Papacy, when its power and influence had become burdensome, and everything was tending to the break-up of the old society and the Reformation.

---

decrees in Wilfrith's case were held of small account; a papal sentence was, we are told, set aside by so eminent a Churchman as Dunstan."

[1] The important dates are:

1532. The Submission of the Clergy.
1533. The Restraint of Appeals.
1534. The Supremacy Act.
Abjuration of Papal Supremacy by the Clergy.
1536. Act for the Dissolution of the Smaller Monasteries.
1539. Act for the Dissolution of the Greater Monasteries.

By the Norman Conquest England became definitely part of the Continental system. The English Church was brought into close connection with the ecclesiastical life of the Continent, and the relation of the Papacy to this country was changed. The Conquest occurred practically just at the time of the Hildebrand reforms, and the full effect of those were experienced by the Church of England. As regards the association with the life of the rest of Christendom, the benefit to England was great; as regards its relation to the Papacy, the advantages were accompanied by many increasing disadvantages.

William the Conqueror started on his expedition to England with the blessing and approval of Pope Alexander II. and the Papacy was not slow to take advantage of this, but William, though he had gained much by ecclesiastical approval, was not prepared to compromise his position. He wrote to Gregory VII.: "Hubert, your legate, Holy Father, coming to me in your behalf, bade me to do fealty to you and your successors, and to think better in the matter of the money which my predecessors were wont to send to the Roman Church: the one point I agreed to, the other I did not agree to. I refused to do fealty, nor will I, because neither have I promised it, nor do I find that my predecessors did it to your predecessors."[1] And, further, he asserted the Royal Supremacy quite definitely. He would not (so Eadmer tells us) allow anyone settled in all his dominion to acknowledge as apostolic the pontiff of the City of Rome, save at his own bidding, or by any means to receive any letter from him if it had not first been shown to himself, and he did not permit the Archbishop of Canterbury, presiding over a general council assembled of Bishops, to ordain or forbid anything save what had first been ordained by himself as agreeable to his own will.

Here we have two notes which run through English history throughout the Middle Ages, on the one side the

[1] Gee and Hardy, *Documents illustrative of English Church History*, pp. 56, 57.

assertion by the Pope of his authority, on the other side the assertion by the King of his.

The spiritual authority of the Popes was an accepted doctrine. It was believed to be derived from St. Peter, who was looked on as the first Bishop of Rome; it was strengthened by the power believed to have been conferred by the donation of Constantine; and in the Canon Law, built up partly on the Pseudo-Decretals, this belief was embodied in a living system. But the acceptance of a doctrine does not necessarily imply the acceptance of every implication which may be drawn from that doctrine. In England, up to the Conquest, while the spiritual supremacy of Rome was universally acknowledged, while gratitude to the Roman Church for what had been received from it was real, and voluntary contributions were readily sent, there had been little interference. It was quite another thing when the Papacy sought to extend its power, and the ecclesiastical history of the Middle Ages is largely the account of the opposition sometimes of the King, sometimes of the Church and nation (which was gradually acquiring consciousness), to Papal encroachments. So long as the Pope's authority was spiritual it was never doubted; when the Papacy used its spiritual power to obtain temporal and financial advantages it was resisted.

It is unnecessary for us to pursue the history in detail. The authority of the Pope attained its highest level when King John was compelled to recognize that he held the kingdom from him as a feudal superior, and Henry III. was very submissive. But other Kings were not so submissive, and even if the Church or the Barons were prepared to accept the assistance of a Pope against a tyrannical sovereign, they both alike resented it when their own traditional privileges were encroached on. The presence of Papal legates was always resented, so William of Malmesbury tells us, and many instances would prove this resentment. Gradually, however, the Pope obtained a larger amount of authority, and the exactions became greater. While the Papacy was the source of so much

spiritual life to the world, and while the interference of the Papacy in national disputes was often at any rate on the side of Justice, the authority was acquiesced in because of the advantages that it brought. But as the Papacy became more corrupt and its exactions greater, as it ceased to be a source of spiritual life, the resentment against it grew stronger. The cost of appeals to Rome, the exactions of Papal lawyers, the heavy payments that had to be made, the encroachments on the right of patronage, were resented by Churchmen. The Crown resented the attempt to interfere with the Royal prerogative, and gradually the sense of National Independence began to grow.

The fourteenth century opened with the Babylonian captivity, and then came the schism. In England there were strong rulers, and under them the authority of the Crown began to assert itself. In 1301 the Parliament of Lincoln repudiated the Papal claims; in 1351 was passed the first Statute of Provisors; in 1353 the first Statute of Præmunire. Side by side with the political dissatisfaction came the religious. William of Ockham and Marsiglio of Padua had denied the Papal supremacy, and in the reign of Edward III. came the life and teaching of Wycliffe.

Wycliffe transplanted the teaching of the schools into ecclesiastical life, and thus created a movement which was looked upon as dangerous both to the State and to the Church. The result was first of all Lollardism, and then the persecution of Lollardism. The establishment of the Inquisition suppressed the dissatisfaction for a time, but undoubtedly paved the way for the more serious outbreak of the Reformation.

It would take too long to develop the contributions of the Middle Ages to the life of the Church in the relation of philosophy and theology. We have to recognize that the Christian faith dominated the thought of the civilized world during the period of the scholastic philosophy in a way in which it has not done before or since. The development of monastic life under the influence of the

monastic reforms of France, the great mediæval buildings, the romance and adventure of the Crusade, were all powerful influences in enriching the religion of the country.

A distinguished writer engaged on a work, the first volume of which has appeared, called *Five Centuries of Religion*, in his preface tells us that he has not troubled to illustrate the higher contributions of the Middle Ages to religion as they have often been described, and he collects together a mass of evidence disparaging to its religious life. I am bound to say that it seems to me a grave misfortune that a man of learning should deliberately produce a one-sided work. It is quite true that there was much superstition in the Middle Ages, but there is much superstition now. If all the strange things which people say and believe at the present day were collected together, the impression of superstition and religious folly would not be far behind that which may be collected from the writings of the Middle Ages. What we demand from our leading scholars is not that they should perform the work of *Advocatus diaboli*, but should give us a well-balanced and sober account of the contribution of the age to religious thought. There was superstition in the Middle Ages, and there is now. There was much failure morally. Men failed to live up to their ideals then as now. An ecclesiastical system with many defects was built up. But there was an amazing amount of creative religious power.

What I should desire particularly to emphasize is the evidence that there seems to me to be of a strain of popular and evangelical religion running all through the mediæval period. For the early period let me take the following: "A manual called the *Lay Folks' Mass Book*, composed by a Canon of Rouen about 1170, and translated into English near the end of the thirteenth century, explains the meaning of every detail in the service and ritual, tells the worshippers what to do, and aids their devotion and memory by putting some of the prayers and explanations of the rubrics into rhyme. Some of

these simple rhyming directions might be used with advantage at the present day; for example, 'when the priest says "sursum corda," then lift up your heart and body, and praise God with the angels':

> "Sweet Jesu, grant me now this,
> That I may come to Thy bliss,
> There with angels for to sing
> The sweet song of Thy loving,
> Sanctus, sanctus, sanctus,
> God grant that it be thus."[1]

To this instance might be added many other examples from the popular literature of the day. At a later date I would take Chaucer's account of the "poure persoun of a toun": "But Cristes lore and His Apostles twelve He taught, and first he folwed it himselve."

It was to this popular evangelical religion that Wycliffe appealed, and it was the suppression of this that caused the bitterness of Lollardism. Only too often, when genuine religious faith is suppressed by any form of authority, it causes bitterness and destroys the beauty of religion. To me, reading the history of the Middle Ages, it would seem that the reality and power of the religious life that was created was largely injured and ruined by the suppression of liberty and the transformation of the Papacy into a political power. In many ways the Middle Ages had done their work; the Reformation did not come because they had failed, but because they had created a demand for something more. The strong vigorous discipline of a more or less legal system of Christianity had created the desire for the gospel of salvation. The Church was really quite ready to give this if it had had freedom, but Rome suppressed all freedom in support of its desire for sovereignty and in the cause of self-interest, and what could not come through constitutional was obliged to come through revolutionary means.

[1] Stephens, *The English Church from the Norman Conquest to the Accession of Edward I.* (1066–1272), pp. 310, 311.

III

We must pass on now to the Reformation and the building up of the Church of England as we know it. This was practically the work of the period from 1532 to 1660, and what I aim at doing is to try and estimate the different forces which made the Church assume the form that it presents at the present day.

Let me speak first, for one minute, of the political causes of the Reformation. The changes we have to chronicle were really brought about by deep and strong forces, but those forces were only able to break loose through the action of Henry VIII. What might have been the course of events if he had acted differently we cannot tell. It is possible the changes might have come in a less violent manner. What we have to recognize is that the changes came as a result of far deeper causes than the divorce of Henry VIII.; that was only the occasion and the opportunity. It is not necessary for us to pass judgment on Henry VIII. There were, indeed, some things to justify his action, but his personal conduct throughout seems to me to be indefensible. There were, no doubt, other motives for the divorce, but nothing, as far as we can see, would have happened if it had not been for the violence of his passion for Anne Boleyn, and nothing can excuse the cruelty and tyranny of his later years.

As regards the suppression of the monasteries, I think we may accept the position that the monasteries had outgrown their usefulness. It is not the accusation of immorality which we need dwell upon; there were, no doubt, monasteries where such accusations were justified; there had been other cases of this in the past. When a system so unnatural as that of the celibate life has been imposed on many unfitted for it, there will always be a danger of lapses. There had been such in past history, and these would give justification to the attacks, but that was not the real justification of action. The Church had an excessive amount of wealth, and was not rendering service proportionate to what it held. Its possessions,

we are told, were over one-fourth of the land of England. In this county the great abbeys of Tewkesbury, Winchcombe, Hailes, and Gloucester, and many smaller ones, must have held an even larger proportion, and they had ceased to render any adequate service in return. We are given precedents for dealing with them. Archbishop Chichele had founded All Souls' College out of the property of the suppressed alien priories; Henry VI. had founded Eton and King's College, Cambridge, from similar sources; Wolsey had suppressed many small monasteries for his great foundation at Christ Church.

If schemes such as those had been initiated for the suppression of the monasteries, if the wealth which they possessed had been used as Cranmer would have used it for creating many new bishoprics, if endowments which had been taken from the livings had been returned to them, if the monasteries had been transformed into great educational centres, how different the religious and intellectual history of this country might have been. It was because of the rapacity and greed which accompanied the suppression of the monasteries that it presents such a deplorable spectacle. The spoliation of buildings, and the destruction of books and treasures and works of art, is one of the most shameful episodes in English history. Henry VIII., who was greedy of money for himself and greedy of money to attach his courtiers to himself, made use of Cromwell as his instrument, and showed equal unscrupulousness in getting rid of him when he had finished his work.

Let us now turn to the more fundamental causes of the Reformation. Bishop Creighton speaks of it as "a great national revolution which found expression in the resolute assertion on the part of England of its national independence." He says further: "There never was a time in England when the Papal authority was not resented, and really the final act of the repudiation of that authority followed quite naturally as the result of a long series of similar acts which had taken place from the earliest times." This description is criticized somewhat

severely by Dr. James Gairdner in his work on *Lollardy and the Reformation in England*. I am bound to say that, as far as I can judge, the statement of Creighton is true, and the criticism of Gairdner unjustified. Although it took a long time to undermine the acceptance of the authority of the Roman Church, the resentment against the exercise of its power had been great: it had been exhibited by the Church as well as by the Kings; it had been shown in popular movements like Lollardy; Churchmen resented interference with their patronage, the enormous extortions of the Papal lawyers, the payments of Annates. The appearance of a Papal legate always embittered people against the Church of Rome. There was, for example, great resentment when Wolsey asserted his precedence over the Archbishop of Canterbury. No doubt there were Papists in the Church. Archbishops and Bishops who had belonged to the monastic orders, or were friars, were on that side, but many of the clergy and Bishops were statesmen in the service of the King, and in such men a national standpoint had gradually developed. The testimony of Tunstall, the well-known Bishop of Durham, who, as far as doctrine goes, was devoted to the traditional religion, is most instructive.

Writing to Pole, July 13, 1536, he says:

"Ye presuppose for a ground, the king's grace to be swerved from the unity of Crist's church, and that in taking upon him the title of supreme head of the church of Englonde, he intendeth to separate his church of Englond from the unity of the whole body of Cristendom; taking upon him the office belonging to spiritual men grounded in the scripture . . . and that he doth not know what longeth to a Cristen king's office, and what unto priesthood; wherein surely both you and all other so thinking of him do err too far. For there is no prince in Cristendom that more regardeth or better knoweth the office and the honour of a Cristen prince, nor that more doth esteem spiritual men that be given to learning and virtue, than he doth. . . .

"For his full purpose and intent is, to see the laws of Almighty God purely and sincerely preached and taught,

and Cristes faith without blot kept and observed in his realm; and not to separate himself, or his realm, any wise from the unity of Crist's Catholic Church, but inviolably, at all times, to keep and observe the same; and to reduce his Church of Englond out of all captivity of foreign powers, heretofore usurped therein, into the pristine estate, that all churches of all realms were in the beginning. . . .

"Ye write in one part of your book, that ye think the hearts of the subjects of this realm greatly offended with abolishing of the bishop of Rome's usurped authority in this realm, as if all the people or most part of them took the matter as ye do. Wherein I do assure you ye be deceived. For the people perceive right well what profit cometh to the realm thereby: and that all such money as before issued that way now is kept within the realm. . . . So that if at this day the king's grace would go about to renew in his realm the said abolished authority of the bishop of Rome, granting him like profits as he had before through this his realm, I think he should find much more difficulty to bring it about in his parliament, and to induce his people to agree thereunto, than anything that ever he purposed in his parliament, since his first reign."

There were men of high character who resented the King's action and suffered for it, but the great body of the nation and the Church also from the beginning were ready to acquiesce. There was no intention of separating from the Catholic Church. The King and those who supported him were only claiming autonomy for the Church of England. They were following a national tradition; they had the example of Gallicanism in France before their eyes. There were many scholars who had attacked the Papal Supremacy. The realm of England was only doing what it claimed to be in accordance with Catholic tradition. They did not desire schism, the schism came through the action of the Pope.

Let us now pass to other leading influences in the history of the Reformation. There were two which might, to a certain extent, balance one another. There was a traditional respect for the historical forms of the

Christian faith. That was sufficiently strong to create more than one rebellion. No doubt there was much resentment at the overthrow, when it came, of altars, crucifixes, and images. Many people, possibly the majority, would have preferred that things should have gone on much as they did in the reign of Henry VIII. We may quote the example of Tunstall, who was quite prepared to acquiesce in repudiating the authority of the Pope, who was prepared also for moderate reform in religious matters, but who was definitely attached to the old order of things, and refused to consider himself a "Sacramentary," as he put it. It was this spirit that led to the strong resentment against the extreme reforms of Edward VI.'s reign and the reaction in favour of Mary, and had it not been for the violence of the Papal reaction, its influence would have been far stronger. Its influence has always remained in the Church of England. It inspired the reforms of Laud, it was not without influence at the Restoration. It remained dormant during the eighteenth century, but again became prominent in the Anglo-Catholic Revival.

Opposed in some ways to this was the tradition of a simple evangelical religion, which, as we have seen, was inherent in the English character. This had become intensified, on the one side, by the cruel suppression of Lollardy; and on the other by the over-development of the externalism and ceremonialism of the Church, by the over-elaborate services of the Sarum use and the artificial development of Church music. Then came the influence of foreign Reformers, the translation of the Bible, the many books inspired by Lutheranism which permeated the country. The persecution of Henry VIII. suppressed a flame which smouldered and burst out strongly in the reign of Edward VI. Popular feeling was not much attracted by the methods of the Reformers or the exhibition of their worship. With the death of Edward VI. the Marian reaction came. In two directions this intensified the feeling. Persecution once more turned evangelical piety into Puritanism, and the exiles of

Geneva brought back a new strain into English theology. If Elizabeth had had her way, the settlement in England would have been much more on the lines of her father's policy, but she could not restrain the violence of Puritanism. So the settlement of her reign was on lines which only half-satisfied the national instincts, and a series of changes now in one direction, now in another, followed, and it was not until the restoration of Charles II. that something like stability was given to the forms of the Church of England.

Meanwhile there was one further influence which was silently working through all these years, and was ultimately to be that which finally shaped the Church of England. It was the element of sober learning.

In the days of Henry VII. and the early years of Henry VIII., a small band of Humanists began their work in England. The leader was Erasmus, who throughout his life preached a reform based on learning; then there was Colet and there was More, and Latimer the scholar, and Grocyn and others.[1] To this body belonged, in his younger days at any rate, Tunstall, and the spirit which they engendered never died out. If we study the life of Tunstall we find this element of humanism working in him, as it did, no doubt, in others in the early days of the Reformation. For a time the more sober courses were checked, but the reforms of Henry VIII. had produced a change in the spirit of the Universities, and there people began to study theological antiquity side by side with classical antiquity. When some measure of peace was given in Queen Elizabeth's reign, we find the beginnings of a learned English theology in Jewel's writings, then came Hooker, Laud, and Andrewes and Cosin, and Pearson, and so the tradition goes on. It is, I believe, as much owing to their work as to any other cause that the tone and temper of the English Church has become what it is.

[1] See on this movement Seebohm, *Oxford Reformers*, and my essay on *Methods of Early Church History* in *History, Authority, and Theology*.

"Anglo-Catholic theology," says Mark Pattison, "is not a system of which any individual thinker can claim the invention. It came necessarily, or by natural development, out of the controversy with the Papal advocates, so soon as that controversy was brought out of the domain of pure reason into that of learning. That this peculiar compromise or via media between Romanism and Calvinism developed itself in England and nowhere else in Christendom is owing to causes which this is not the place to investigate, but it was a product not of English soil, but of theological learning."[1]

It was due to the interaction of all those forces that the Church of England was built up. In Henry VIII.'s time the separation from Rome came, and the seeds of all the different movements were present. The Evangelical reform movement was improperly checked, and that and political causes led to the violent changes of Edward VI.'s time. Romanism had once more a chance under Queen Mary, and lost it completely. Anglo-Catholicism began to assert itself under the Stuarts, but, not content with teaching, found it necessary to try to promote its influence by allying itself with the civil power and an unpopular theory of government. Persecution caused a reaction, and Puritanism had once more an opportunity; but Puritanism was alien to the English mind, and the final settlement came in the Church restoration, which inherited the traditions of English learning and combined the different elements which had contributed to its growth.

It is sometimes maintained that the Church of England is what it is because of the personal characters and religious idiosyncrasies of Henry and Elizabeth and Charles. No doubt the personal influence of powerful rulers does tell, but it is dependent on the forces with which it has to deal. No King, however powerful, can accomplish much, unless his desires harmonize with those of his people. The influence of the Crown did not give the Church of England its present form; if anything, it

[1] Mark Pattison, *Life of Casaubon.*

checked its natural development. The lines the English Reformation took were the result of forces and tendencies which had been present from the earliest days of the English Church, guided and controlled by the influence of sound learning.

IV

Since the Restoration settlement the Church of England has changed little in outward form. We have still the same Prayer Book, and the same Thirty-nine Articles, and (if we allow for the change which modern ways of thought have produced) very much the same theological outlook. One of the most learned books produced in the seventeenth century was Pearson's *Vindiciæ Ignatianæ;* one of the most learned books of the nineteenth century was Lightfoot's *Apostolic Fathers.* Walton's *Polyglott* has worthy successors in Westcott and Hort's *Greek Testament,* in Wordsworth and White's *Vulgate,* in Burkitt's *Evangelion Da-Mepharreshe,* in Horner's *Coptic Versions,* in Brooke and McLean's *Octateuch,* and many minor works. We still discuss Roman claims, and have Vestiarian controversies, and produce occasionally, but unsystematically, editions and monographs on the Fathers. But really there have been many and profound changes.

The first lesson that has been learnt is that of religious tolerance and freedom. The tradition of persecution was the most fatal inheritance from the Middle Ages. All parties alike thought it a moral obligation to produce religious unity by compulsion, and one after another they showed the futility and failure of their methods. If Henry had not suppressed the Evangelical movement by violence, the changes of Edward's reign would have been less violent. If the destruction of the old ways under Edward had not been so violent, Mary would not have been welcomed with such enthusiasm; if Mary had not persecuted, the Elizabethan settlement would have been different. If Laud had been content with persuasion, there would have been no Puritan revolution. If the laity of the Restoration had been less vindictive, there would have been little dissent in England. Gradu-

ally, in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, the principles of religious liberty were hammered out, and at any rate theoretically it has become part of the traditions of State and Church alike. That the full implications of religious liberty are not yet understood is only too apparent. We shall later study something of the failure.

With toleration has come comprehension. The ideal of the Reformation was not only the suppression of all dissent outside the Church, but the imposition of uniformity within it, and such uniformity has generally been the aim and desire of ecclesiastics. This uniformity was to be accomplished by the visitatorial authority of the Crown and the Archbishop, and by special powers entrusted to a court of High Commission. The final attempt was the Act of Uniformity of 1662. But when special powers were taken away, it became gradually apparent that uniformity was not very easy to assert. The parish priest inherited the position of a freeholder, and that freehold has been one of the most potent influences in shaping the English Church. This position as a freeholder implies that no parson can be removed from his parish except by proper legal process, and whatever may be the action of the ecclesiastical courts, he has always an appeal to the protection of the civil courts. Moreover, the tradition of the common law has always been to decide in favour of the freeholder. The result is that the position of a parish priest in England has always been a very secure one, except at such times as the Crown has been armed with special powers.

Some of the implications of this position I will discuss later. At the moment the important point for us to notice is that to this we owe the comprehensiveness of the English Church. I have, in the course of this sketch, defined the various traditional elements in the English Church. All these have been able both to retain their position and assert their influence, owing to the secure position of the parish priest. Latitudinarians, Evangelicals, Tractarians, Modernists alike, find themselves defended by the security of their tenure. Gradually it has

become recognized that men of different mind and temperament express their religion in different ways, and that if a Church is to unite a nation together, it will be necessary that it should be not only tolerant but comprehensive.

How great has been the spiritual value of the great movements of religious thought in the Church of England ! At a time when spiritual life in Europe had sunk very low, the Evangelical movement stirred up new conceptions of personal religion, of philanthropic effort, and missionary zeal. If we realize one thing alone—that it took away the reproach of slavery—we can estimate what it has accomplished. The Oxford Movement added to the ideal of individual Christianity a corporate ideal. Working in harmony with many intellectual tendencies of the time, it revived the idea of historic continuity. It made real once more the sacramental element in the Christian heritage. It enriched our religious conceptions by calling in the service of history and art. Its influence is still working far outside the limits of the Anglican community. The Modernist movement (to give it its newest name), enabled as it is to attack the problems which changes in thought are creating, is seeking to bring philosophy and science into harmony with Christian theology. All these movements have brought out, some no doubt in a one-sided way, part of the heritage of the English Church.

But an even wider change has been caused by the wide extension of the English Church, the result of British colonization, of the wide extent of the British Empire, and the development of missionary work. Two hundred years ago the Church of England was almost confined to these islands. In England it was the Church of the great body of the people. In Scotland there was a small and persecuted remnant of Episcopalians. In Ireland there was a state church alienated from the mass of the people. In the plantations overseas there were congregations. The extension began when Bishop Seabury was consecrated for America in 1784. Gradually legal difficulties were overcome and new bishoprics were

founded. Bishop Middleton was consecrated Bishop of Calcutta in 1813. It is interesting to think that that diocese has included not only all India, but Ceylon, Mauritius, Australia, and New Zealand. It might be held to have satisfied even the most ardent advocate of large bishoprics. We need not pursue the history. The important point is that at the present day there are between 300 and 400 Bishops in the Anglican Communion with dioceses in all parts of the world. Now the importance of this is that it is changing the whole aspect and character of the Church of England. Originally it was a national Church which had certain characteristics of its own, it is true, but was simply important as being the Church of the English nation. Now it is more and more outgrowing that characteristic, and coming to stand as representative of a special type of Christianity. It is not only an Episcopal Church, but is developing in its Theology and Order certain features of its own which it would present as the contribution of its life and thought and learning to the religious life of the world. This type that it aspires to present may be described as Free Evangelical Catholicism. We shall come back to it at the end of our investigations.

I have tried to depict in this cursory sketch the different elements that have contributed to the building of the Church of England. I would conclude by pointing out that we must look upon it as a living branch of Christ's Church. The Christian Church, we have pointed out, was founded not on a code of laws, not on a creed, not even on a rule of life, but on the Divine Person of Jesus Christ. A Divine Person contains infinite possibilities, possibilities which cannot be confined within any rule or code. A living Church is one which inherits the traditions of Christ and the life of His Spirit. Such a Church, unhampered by the writings of any particular theologian, is enabled to attach itself to newer circumstances and times, and it is the power of applying great principles of religion to newer circumstances which must be the test of reality and power of the Christian Church.

CHAPTER III

THE DOCTRINAL TEACHING OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

I WISH to-day to discuss with you the doctrinal position of the Church of England. Now that is a task, you will probably tell me, which should occupy not a short discourse but a volume, or perhaps volumes. That is true, and I can at any rate claim that I have for many years been engaged on the task of producing those volumes, that I have large piles of paper filled with my work, and that if life and strength and opportunity are granted me I hope to accomplish the larger work. Meanwhile there is a real advantage in attempting within short limits to state certain main characteristics of our Theology. I propose to say something on the following points:

1. Our doctrinal authority.
2. The creed of the Christian.
3. The theory of the Sacraments.

I

The fundamental principle of the Church of England is the supremacy of Scripture. It is, however, important to lay stress on the exact language used. "Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation, so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man that it should be believed as an article of Faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation."

Here we have an instance of the wise moderation which has distinguished so much in our English formularies, and has made the position of the English Church one that can be accepted without difficulty at the present day. While there was much extravagant language used about

the Scripture at the time of the Reformation, and similar language has prevailed in some circles and at some periods in the Church of England, nothing to support it can be found in our formularies. No claim is made for any sort of inerrancy, nor for anything like verbal inspiration, and these are not doctrines of our Church. The gain of this has become apparent in recent years. The progress of critical investigation has made it impossible for a candid and thoughtful person to hold any such theories. We know that the Bible contains historical mistakes. We know that much of its teaching is inconsistent with scientific discovery. On such points we cannot use it. But if we confine its authority to the purpose for which the Church exists—the teaching of religious truth—we shall find that nothing need diminish its authority.

And then within that sphere we recognize that the Bible does not give us anything approaching a complete system of theology, nor a complete system of Church life. It gives us rather the greater principles of divine truth concerning God and human life which are necessary for our guidance. We get no authority either from the Bible itself or from our English Church for imposing an elaborate system of doctrine, or an exact acquaintance with theological definition, or a particular form of church order, or even a rigid code of ethics, as necessary in any sense for salvation.

But the Church of England, while recognizing the supremacy of Scripture, recognizes also the authority of the Church, and here again let us examine our definitions.

"The Church hath power to decree Rites or Ceremonies and authority in Controversies of Faith."

But it is always subordinate to Scripture:

"It is not lawful for the Church to ordain anything that is contrary to God's Word written."

Nor can any claim be made to infallibility:

"As the Church of Jerusalem, Alexandria, and Antioch have erred; so also the Church of Rome hath erred, not

only in their living and manner of Ceremonies, but also in matters of Faith."

And this applies even to General Councils:

"And when they be gathered together (forasmuch as they be an assembly of men, whereof all be not governed with the Spirit and Word of God), they may err, and sometimes have erred, even in things pertaining unto God."

And then as to the Creeds; here again the language is most cautious:

"The Three Creeds . . . ought thoroughly to be received and believed: for they may be proved by most certain warrants of holy Scripture."

The Creeds are accepted on the authority of the Church, but are subordinated to the Scriptures, and have no authority apart from the Scriptures.

The official language of the Church of England is, in fact, remarkable for a studied reasonableness and moderation, which contrast with the many claims that have been made and the language that has been used elsewhere, and is of great advantage to us when we attempt to solve the problems of authority presented to us now. When our formularies were drawn up there were various different authorities appealed to with great vehemence—the Pope, the Church, and the Scriptures. The Church of England attempted to deal with those claims reasonably. Now there is a further difficulty raised. Is there any authority at all to which we can appeal? Is not the whole idea of authority wrong? This position—which is, I believe, entirely mistaken—has been strengthened by extravagant claims which have been made, and the moderate and reasonable language of our formularies makes it much easier to deal with the problems as they are presented in a modern way. The great difficulty has been the desire for infallibility. There is a natural desire in many people to be able to say that some authority is certainly and exactly true. It appears to create a feeling of confidence. Some have sought it in the infallibility of the Bible. Others in the infallibility of the

Church; either in the Church of the Four Great Councils, or the Undivided Church of the first ten centuries, or some imaginary Church which represents the agreement of the East and West. Others, again, could find a refuge from the uncertainties and difficulties of modern thought in an alleged infallibility of the Pope.

Now to none of these positions do our formularies assent. There is no claim that Scripture is infallible. There is only the statement that it contains all things necessary for salvation. The value of the Church is recognized as a guide in religious controversies, and in ordering rites and ceremonies, but its limitations are as clearly stated. Nor is there any definition to tell us where the Church is to be found. The infallibility of the Pope is certainly denied, and we may assent to the complete correctness of that attitude. Certainly, the Bible is not infallible; equally true is it that no creed, no definition, no theologian, no period in the Church, no council can make any such claim. All these represent just the best interpretation of the Christian faith possible at that day and suited to the needs of that day. Now this absence of any sign of dogmatic infallibility harmonizes with the character of the Gospel narrative. It is remarkable throughout the words of our Lord how seldom we get those clear definite propositions which might form the basis of dogmatic statement. Fundamental ethical and spiritual principles we do find. If we read them right, we can learn what we require from them. But the clear-cut dogmatic statement or the fixed rule of conduct we do not find. Nor, if we think over it, does experience teach us that dogmatic infallibility is what we desire. The inherited statements of Christian Faith are, indeed (as our Church teaches), of great value, and we do not desire to repudiate them, but to give them any sort of infallibility transforms them from being a useful guide into being a grave hindrance to truth. As an historical document the Athanasian Creed is of great value; as an infallible statement it is condemned; and that is why, however useful to a theologian and if rightly interpreted to the

NORWICH PUBLIC LIBRARIES

Church, its use in the public services is of doubtful value.

The teaching of the Church of England in our formularies rose out of, and was adapted to, the circumstances and problems of the sixteenth century. It showed in approaching those problems a balanced mind, and gave solutions which, as knowledge progressed, still remained satisfactory. The problems of that day were somewhat different from those of the present day, but I think that our traditional Church teaching, adapted to the changed conditions of modern thought, may suggest to us the manner in which we may harmonize the various functions of Scripture, of tradition, and Church authority, and the means for obtaining a real knowledge of Christian Faith.

We believe that in the Bible we have the record of a divine revelation given to mankind through Jesus Christ, the Son of God—a revelation telling us of God, and the destiny of man and human salvation. To learn the contents and meaning of that revelation, we should study the teaching and life of Jesus, and the Apostolic teaching.

To help us to understand it, we turn to the Christian tradition, the record of what Christianity has been, and that enables us to see how it has been presented to the world. The fundamental principles of Christianity have been codified in the Christian creed, and have been handed down to us in that form at the present day. Here we have the fundamental teaching of Christianity; here we learn the right proportion of the Christian Faith. Yet if we cut off the creed from the Gospel which is its source, it speedily loses its vitality, it becomes arid and unreal.

Yet this is not the whole of revelation. The Spirit of Christ working in the Church is to guide us into all truth. The human reason inspired by God's Spirit illuminates, by the teaching of Christ, the results of the progress of human thought. The original teaching develops. The meaning is continuously being brought out to suit changing circumstances; it is applied to new conditions. What was purely potential is energized into life, its scope

becomes greater as the human mind expands. The Church must not be confined and limited by its inheritance. The inheritance must be expanded and illuminated by its life.

And in this task no part of the Church but bears its part. I have already shown that we cannot banish from the Church any body of Christians who accept the faith of Christ, although we may admit that some representations of that faith are imperfect. So there is no branch of the Christian Church which does not contribute to the interpretation of the Gospel. We must learn from the whole Christian Church, and we may perhaps find that some isolated Christian society has preserved from neglect an element in the Christian tradition which was in danger of being forgotten.

So let us take as our authority for Christian teaching:

1. The revelation through Jesus Christ recorded for us in the pages of the Old and New Testament.

2. The tradition of the Christian Church handed down from generation to generation and embodied from time to time in creeds, in articles of faith, in writings of theologians, some transitory, some more permanent, some of greater, some of less authority, but none infallible.

3. The development and expansion of this teaching by the whole Christian Church under the guidance of the Holy Spirit.

The Gospel of Christ in its entirety is something that transcends the grasp of any one man, or any generation or any branch of the Christian society. The witness of the whole Church is the fulness of Christ.[1]

[1] The problems I have touched upon in this section have been studied recently in two interesting works. Bishop Gore in *The Holy Spirit and the Church* discusses the relation of Authority and the Spirit; Mr. Rawlinson in *Authority and Freedom*, the Bishop Paddock Lectures for 1923, discusses the modern problems of Authority in relation to intellectual freedom. The above was written before I had read either work, but I hope the exposition of Christian Authority here set forth will not conflict with a due regard to the freedom of the Spirit or the due claims of individual and intellectual independence.

The problem of authority is one which meets us in many directions, not only in religion, but in politics, in social life, in science. There are times when the weight of authority becomes so heavy that it destroys all mental initiative, and binds all life under the heavy yoke of tradition. There are times when the disregard of tradition threatens the break-up of society. Authority may be defined as the sum of inherited human experience, and it is obvious that a large portion of our life depends entirely upon this inherited experience. Unless a scientific investigator knows what his predecessors have accomplished, much of his work will be wasted. But if his mind is not strong enough to grasp all that has been done easily, his power of initiative will be lost. The human mind easily and quickly begins to work in grooves. Progress depends on the due balance of knowledge and originality, of authority and freedom.

The value of authority is higher in the Christian religion, but the need for the freedom of the Spirit is greater also. The basis of Christian theology is that in a special and particular way God revealed Himself to mankind through His Son, that in Christ Jesus we learn what is real. But that revelation was, as we have shown, not a code of laws or rules. It was a revelation of the fundamental principles of God and the world which each generation needed to interpret for itself. In religion, perhaps more than in any other part of life, tradition and habit become overpowering. Therefore the danger of a deadness which will make our creeds and rules mere formulas is great, and the authority of tradition must always be enlightened by the life of the Spirit. I hope that the conciliation I have attempted gives its due weight to both elements in life, and is loyal to the spirit of a Church which has always endeavoured to keep the mean between "too much stiffness in refusing," and "too much easiness in admitting any variation."

II

What is the creed of the Church of England ?

The doctrinal inheritance of the Reformation from the Middle Ages was two-sided. The traditional Christian creed was, as it always had been, simple. To the dogmatic decrees of the first Seven Councils, which had formulated the faith of the Church and had given us the creed, little had been added by authority. The Fourth Lateran Council had made Transubstantiation an article of faith; the Council of Florence had, perhaps, given the same authority to the doctrine of Papal Supremacy; but, for the most part, the formal creed of the Church was simple as it always had been.

Then, on the other side, many centuries of theological thought and disputation had added an elaborate theological system. Peter Lombard in his *Sententiæ Aureæ* had formulated the teaching of the Fathers, and that had formed the basis of the many volumes of systematized thought which the Middle Ages produced. The Canon Law, also, had gradually grown up into a complicated and elaborate system, and Christian worship in the hands of those whose whole life was devoted to the service of the Church had become as highly developed. However simple might still be the creed, there was a highly organized, highly elaborate system of life and thought which was accepted as of obligation, and (when questioned) imposed by the power of the Inquisition. Even to eat meat on a Friday was heresy, and might render a man liable to be burnt at the stake.

When at the Reformation the different religious bodies began to organize themselves, the tendency grew up to define the whole of Christian belief in a manner often burdensome to the human conscience. The Reformation, while on the one side a reaction from the Middle Ages, on the other side inherited and stereotyped much of the teaching of the Schoolmen. Each Church adopted a different formula, and on many points on which freedom of discussion had prevailed laid down a defined position.

So Catholicism and Protestantism and all the many divisions of Protestantism marshalled themselves in different camps. The decrees of the Council of Trent and the many reformed confessions became elaborate articles of disunion. Many of them were long; they attempted to cover the whole field of Christian thought, and to define what was held to be truth so exactly as to rule out and condemn any contrary opinion.

The contribution of the Church of England to this series was the Thirty-nine Articles, and they occupy rather a remarkable position. There is an element of moderation in them. Our Church had always, partly under the force of circumstances, aimed at comprehension. It left many things undefined. When it did define, it tried to make its definitions include a wide variety of opinion. It is quite possible for a loyal English Churchman without any insincerity to be either a Calvinist or an Arminian, to hold any teaching on the Sacrament, except possibly Zwinglianism or Transubstantiation. Another tendency has been to be more practical in its conception of religion; to lay less stress on dogmatic or theoretical questions, and to emphasize the importance of the Christian life. Its tendency has been, therefore, to concentrate attention on the more fundamental truths of the Christian Church. It is remarkable that it has never produced a systematic treatise on Christian theology. This tendency has developed, and the experience of later generations is strengthening its position.

A position such as this was that which the Undivided Church held. In the controversies of five centuries, it had formulated a creed. This it put forth for universal acceptance. It concentrated attention on the fundamental articles of the Christian faith. It forbade any other creed to be put forth. It forbade any addition to be made to this creed. We may express a wish that people had been as tenacious in avoiding additions to the creed as they have been in defending its exact phraseology. The Church of England has followed the example of the Undivided Church in giving so great a

position to the inherited creeds. It has always avoided giving an undue weight to particular aspects of the Christian Faith which have been important for a time. It has not over-emphasized Justification by Faith, or Predestination or Free Will, or a particular doctrine of the Sacraments, or a particular doctrine of the ministry. Parties within have done this, but it has never done so. This tendency of our Church has influenced its development, and harmonizes with our aims at the present day. We aim at concentrating our attention on the more fundamental doctrines of the Church, and that I propose now to do.

What is the Christian Faith? It is the belief in the Revelation of God through Jesus Christ, Himself the Son of God, who lived and died on earth for the salvation of mankind, and through whom we receive the Gift of God's Holy Spirit. If we put it more technically it is the doctrines of the Incarnation, the Atonement, and the Trinity that sum up for us the religion of the Christian. It is that teaching which is presented to us in the creed; it is that teaching which we sometimes call the Gospel of Christ; it is that teaching which we are appointed to give to those who are entrusted to our care.

Now in relation to that I would first speak of three difficulties which are felt at the present day. The first is, perhaps, academic and theological, but it is raised whenever anyone begins to study theology seriously. It is the authority of what we sometimes call the Chalcedonian Christology. That is given us in the Second Article:

"The Son, which is the Word of the Father, begotten from everlasting of the Father, the very and eternal God, and of one substance with the Father, took Man's nature in the womb of the Blessed Virgin, of her substance: so that two whole and perfect Natures, that is to say, the Godhead and Manhood, were joined together in one Person, never to be divided, whereof is one Christ, very God, and very Man: who truly suffered, was crucified, dead and buried, to reconcile his Father to us, and to be a sacrifice, not only for original guilt, but also for all actual sins of men."

This is the traditional definition. It is much criticized at the present day, and the question is raised, What is its authority? It is maintained by some that we are to look upon the decrees of councils and such other formal expressions of faith as infallible. Now it is, I think, quite clear that the language of our Church does not justify us in ascribing to them such a measure of authority. Councils, it definitely tells us, may err. They may err, or their language may become obsolete. I should not, therefore, feel any difficulty if it were found necessary to substitute for this definition one with a phraseology more suited to the present day, and whatever could be drawn from later philosophical thought to help us to understand the doctrine would be our gain. But there is not, I think, any necessity for this. What the Chalcedonian definition does is no more, it seems to me, than to guard by exact language the true divinity and the true humanity of Christ. We need not give any technical meaning to the term "nature," and may take the definition as intended to assure us of the unity of Christ's Person, and of the reality alike of His human and divine life. Nothing else would satisfy the language of Scripture, or our own religious instincts.

The second point on which I would speak is the doctrine of the Virgin Birth. Here again there has been an unnecessary rigidity and an unnecessary scepticism. The Virgin Birth is not the Incarnation (as is sometimes taught), or an essential part of that doctrine. The essential thing is that the Son of God became man, and the evidence of that is not dependent on the story of the birth of Christ. It is taught us by far wider and more far-reaching considerations. If it were proved that the story of the birth of our Lord were a myth, or the outcome of religious symbolism, or an attempt to teach abstract truth through concrete images, that would not take away from the reality of the doctrine of the Incarnation or the evidence for it. The essential truth does not depend on what some have thought to be too weak a support.

But when I turn to the evidence, I can find no strong reasons for this scepticism. The arguments against the story are not strong. It is really objected to on *a priori* grounds. Critical difficulties which have been raised have been deprived of authority with increasing knowledge. The belief in the Virgin Birth is clearly older than either of the narratives which relate it. It does not prove the Incarnation; we believe it because we accept the Incarnation, and it harmonizes with that belief.

The third point to which I would refer is the doctrine of the Atonement. One hundred years ago, even fifty years ago, there was widely taught what was held to be the orthodox doctrine of the Atonement. It was often called the " plan of salvation." That teaching presents the Christian doctrine in a way which does not appeal to many circles at the present day; it seems, in fact, unreal. But if we turn to the history of Christian doctrine, we find that teaching put into its proper perspective. We find that while the Atonement through the life and death of Christ has always been a fundamental belief, different theories and explanations of it have prevailed at different times. All Christians have felt the need and reality of the Redemption in Christ; " Jesus Christ for us men and our salvation came down from heaven "; but each generation has expressed that salvation in its own way. When, for example, the reality and malignancy of the powers of evil was so intensely believed, it was as a victory over those powers that the meaning of the Atonement was concerned. Such teaching would be to us unreal. We express the need, and therefore the remedy, in a different way. So, too, the idea of Christ paying the penalty of our sins appealed with great force to a generation now passed. To most people at the present day that has little meaning. But there are many who feel with great intensity the reality and power of the sacrifice of the death of Christ. It gives to them in a way that nothing else can an explanation of human life. A generation which has learnt that all its well-being is dependent upon sacrifice can learn,

too, that that sacrifice is not anything accidental or imperfect. It is part of the deepest reality of things. It is the exhibition of that love which is the highest thing in the world. It is an attribute even of the divine nature itself.

It is, I think, the whole meaning and intention of the Church of England to concentrate our attention on the central truths of the Christian Faith, and if you are carrying out its purpose, you will concentrate the attention of your people on these truths. You will teach them of God, and of Jesus Christ, and the Holy Spirit, of the Incarnation and the Atonement and the Trinity. These you will put in the front place and not the minor matters of the law, and you will put them in such a way that they will appeal to your people and they will feel the reality. For we know that the present age is impatient of dogmatic definition, and thinks that all dogmas (as it is fond of calling them) are unreal and without meaning. We should try always to put what we have to teach not in a conventional or traditional way, but in such a way as to bring out what is real, and to express it always in relation to human conduct and experience.

What does the Incarnation mean? It means this, that Jesus Christ, who is the Son of God, came down on earth (to use, of course, conventional language) and revealed to us the nature of God, the purpose of the world, the true life of man. "No man has seen God at any time; the only-begotten, who is in the bosom of the Father, He hath revealed Him." We cannot know or understand God: we can know Him as revealed in Christ. Jesus Christ reveals God to man by His teaching, and by His life. He lives for man, and He dies for man; and so He teaches us that love is of the essence of God, revealed in a life of service and of sacrifice. The true life of man consists in love and service and sacrifice. Here we have fundamental truth. Here we have reality.

And as to the doctrine of the Trinity: God is in His essence love. That means that love is part of His eternal nature. But love demands an object as well as a subject.

Therefore, the nature of the Godhead is not simple; in it there must be a plurality of persons. God is one, yet in the Godhead there must be such a distinctness as will make divine love a reality. Again, God is to us both transcendent and imminent—God (to use our human language) the Father, the Creator and Ruler of the world; God the Son, who lived on earth as man; God the Holy Spirit, imminent in the world and inspiring mankind. The Trinity is the revelation of the work and love of God.

And this is reality. There are two conceptions of what is real in the world. The one tells us that everything that we touch and feel and taste and see is real; the world of our senses, the world of material things. And if this be real, and as some would tell us the only reality, then our minds are naturally set on this world, and we live for it. But Christianity tells us that the true reality is God, and the world as God looks at it; that the real things are righteousness, and love and sacrifice. Now the test of reality must ultimately lie in experience, and we know that if men are too eagerly set on the things of the world, they do not ever win the world; but if they set their affections on things above, they win happiness in the world and make the world good for others. The true reality is that which Christianity teaches us.

The spirit of the age is said to demand that we should dispense with dogmatic truths. When such assertions are made they come, I think, from shallow misapprehension. We have inherited Christian doctrine, but we must not teach it as tradition, but as a living reality. It is in its nature theoretical, but we must teach it as something intimately bound up with human life, and in that way we may bring home to people that it is real in a way which nothing else is.

III

I come to my third point—the teaching on the Sacraments.

An almost universal accompaniment of any religion must be sacred rites, which have for those who take part

in them a mystical significance. Christianity, therefore, being a religion adapted to the conditions of human life, has exhibited such sacramental rites, and we should naturally expect, if it be of divine origin, that it should be such as to respond to the needs of human nature, and respond to those needs in the highest way conceivable. All our evidence goes to show that our Lord accepted for Himself and His Church the rite of Baptism which had been instituted by John the Baptist, and gave it a deeper meaning. He also celebrated with His disciples a sacred Supper, which He bid them continue in memory of Him.

When we turn to the Apostolic Church, we find that from the beginning it celebrated these two rites. We also find other sacred rites beginning to prevail, whether instituted by the Apostles themselves or derived from some action of their Master, especially the laying on of hands on the newly-baptized that they might receive the Holy Ghost, and on those appointed to the Christian ministry.

If we pass to the days of the growing and developing Church, we find that the two great rites of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, or, as it came to be called, the Eucharist or the Offering, are regarded as of the greatest significance. Baptism—the ceremony of passage from the pagan to the Christian life—had an importance greater than that which it possesses in days when the whole community has become Christian, an importance which it at once assumes again in the mission field. It was celebrated with elaborate rites; it was an impressive ceremonial, and influenced deeply the minds of those who received it. The Eucharist was undoubtedly the principal service of the Church, and, at any rate from the fourth century onwards, the Eucharistic service was one of great magnificence.

The development of these rites harmonized with the religious tendencies of the day. The second and third centuries were periods when, owing to the decay of national religions, new cults, often of foreign origin, which

transcended national bounds prevailed. These it is the custom now to group together as mystery religions. They often were characterized by strange and elaborate rites. Much play is made in modern religious history with these " mysteries "; they have had an importance ascribed to them which is not justified by the evidence, and have been supposed to have influenced to a great extent the development of Christianity. There has been much exaggeration. There is no evidence at all that they had anything to do with the origin of the Christian Sacraments, which are Hebraic, not Hellenic; simple and ethical, and not magical. It is possible, however, that the environment in which it was placed may have contributed to the form in which the Christian rites developed, and the heathen rites themselves were acted upon by Christian belief, as is happening now with Eastern religions. Other rites also assumed considerable importance. Anointing with laying on of hands was generally an accompaniment of baptism; Ordination was carefully performed, and an elaborate system of Penance grew up.

But while during the patristic period of Church history the Sacraments were of grave importance and there was considerable elaboration in externals, two points must be noted. In the first place, there was no system of Sacraments. The term Sacrament was used with a very indefinite signification. It was applied to a great variety of religious rites, or parts of a rite. While certain rites, to which the name " Sacrament," or, in the Greek, " mystery," was applied, stood out as of great importance, many customs to which the name was given were quite trivial. And then, secondly, there was no fixed or definite doctrinal teaching. While quite early there was a good deal of what we may reasonably call superstition—for new converts naturally brought over much of their religious presuppositions—and while, on the other hand, there was much sober and wholesome theological teaching, no attempt was made at any doctrinal definition.

As Christianity developed and became an established faith, and as the intellectual life of the ancient world decayed, religion began to be more formal and stereotyped. Gradually a sacramental system grew up with fixed doctrinal teaching. The external side of religion was emphasized, and the spiritual and ethical side seemed to be of less account. But the full development was not until quite late. The fixing of the Sacraments at seven, neither more nor less, did not take place in the Western Church until the twelfth century, nor in the Eastern Church until the fifteenth. An elaborate theological explanation of the Sacraments was the work of the Schoolmen, who carefully defined the form and matter of each Sacrament—that is, the particular form of words and of outward action that was held to be necessary to make the Sacrament valid or effective. It was at the Fourth Lateran Council in A.D. 1215 that Transubstantiation was made an article of faith. This doctrinal development was accompanied by an elaborate practical system, especially in relation to the Sacrament of Penance, and associated with this system were elaborate financial arrangements, which did not tend to edification.

I do not think that it is unfair to say that there was much superstition and corruption connected with the sacramental system, that a mechanical, almost magical, system of sacrament prevailed, and that the tendency was to substitute an external system of works, in the main ecclesiastical works, for an ethical or evangelical Christianity.

It was against this system that there was at the Reformation a twofold revolt. There was the revolt of the Humanist, and the revolt of the Puritan. The revolt of the Puritan was the reaction of an Evangelical religion against a system which appeared to destroy the religion of experience. The revolt of the Humanist was historical and intellectual. Both these movements influenced the English Reformation and the form of our modern English Christianity, the latter the more powerfully. The tendency has been to recognize the due place of

Sacraments in the Christian Church, but to reform the teaching on Biblical, primitive, and ethical lines.

The lines of development of the English Church may be described as follows:

1. First, there was a tendency to simplification. We have seen that the fixing of the number of Sacraments at seven was late and artificial. The English Church has always insisted on the supremacy of those two Sacraments which may be more particularly described as Sacraments of the Gospel, and to them, in a special and particular way, it reserves the name of Sacraments. Other rites and ordinances of the Church—confirmation, ordination, penance—were preserved; their sacramental character was recognized; the name Sacrament was not refused, but that there are two Sacraments "generally necessary for salvation," "given to us, ordained by Christ Himself," our Church insists definitely, strongly, and rightly.

2. Then, secondly, our Church has always avoided over-definition, when definition is not possible. It refused to limit belief either positively or negatively. The term "Transubstantiation" was condemned. Zwinglianism was condemned, but it is difficult to find any other of the many theories which were put forward at the time of the Reformation, or might be extracted from the works of the Fathers, which might not be held with complete loyalty to the Church of England, which always teaches that "the body and blood of Christ are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper." Its teaching is summed up in well-known words of Hooker:

"Take therefore that wherein all agree, and then consider by itself what cause why the rest in question should not rather be left as superfluous than urged as necessary. It is on all sides plainly confessed, first that this Sacrament is a true and a real participation of Christ, who thereby imparteth himself, even his whole entire Person, *as a mystical Head* unto every soul that receiveth him, and that every such receiver doth thereby incorporate or unite himself unto Christ as a *mystical*

member of him, yea, of them also whom he acknowledgeth to be his own; secondly, that to whom *the person of Christ* is thus communicated, to them he giveth by the same Sacrament his Holy Spirit to sanctify them, as it sanctifieth him which is their head; thirdly, that what *merit, force or virtue soever there is in his sacrificial body and blood*, we freely, fully and wholly have it by this sacrament; fourthly, that the *effect thereof in us is a real transmutation of our souls and bodies* from sin to righteousness, from death and corruption to immortality and life; fifthly, that because the sacrament, being of itself but a corruptible and earthly creature, must needs be thought an unlikely instrument to work so admirable effects in man, we are therefore to rest ourselves together upon *the strength of his glorious power* who is able and will bring to pass that the bread and cup which he giveth us shall be truly the thing he promiseth."[1]

3. Then, thirdly, the Church of England repudiated anything which might be considered mechanical or magical in Sacraments. The essence of a Christian Sacrament is that it is something "ethical" or "evangelical." So the Church of England always insists on the element of faith in the recipient of a Sacrament as a necessary condition of its efficacy, and lays particular stress on the worthy state of the receiver. "Judge therefore yourselves, brethren, that ye be not judged of the Lord; repent you truly for your sins past; have a lively and steadfast faith in Christ our Saviour; amend your lives and be in perfect charity with all men; so shall ye be meet partakers of those holy mysteries."

In the last hundred years there has been a revival in the Church of England, and we may add outside its limits, of respect for the Sacraments of the Church—a revival which in itself is healthy; but it has been accompanied by a good deal of most inadequate theology, and an attempt to revive something of the system which was discarded at the Reformation. The less satisfactory theology of the Mediæval Church or the modern Roman Church is copied, and some rather unintelligent language

[1] Hooker, *Ecclesiastical Polity*, V., lxvii. 7.

of our own is introduced. In an address, for example, sent by certain members of the Church of England to the Eastern Church, it was definitely stated that the Church of England accepted definitely the Seven Sacraments. A good deal of mechanical and, as it seems to me, unreal language is used. The doctrine of the Apostolical succession is taught in a mechanical way. Grace is said to have come down from the Apostles by the golden channel of laying on of hands. And it is implied that, except in that way, the gift of the Holy Spirit is not given. I heard the other day of a Suffragan Bishop who explained confirmation by the analogy of a photograph. Before the click of the photographer, the plate has nothing on it; after the click there is the impression. So when hands are laid, the Holy Spirit comes like the impression on the photograph. We have similar uneducated language among English Roman Catholics, as, for example, when we are told that the priest has the power given of making the body and blood of Christ.

Now all language like this is most harmful. It is bad theology. It suggests a mechanical idea of Sacrament and divine grace. It puts stumbling-blocks in the way of many people. It is saying what the majority of people can't believe, and won't believe, and ought not to believe.

There are three great points to remember about all sacramental teaching. In the first place, the Sacraments are performed not by the Bishop or priest, but by the Church; and the Minister of the Sacrament is Christ. The priest is but the minister of the Church through whom it acts. Let me give you two statements which will corroborate this. Khomiakoff, the Russian theologian, says: "The Seven Sacraments are in reality not accomplished by any single individual who is worthy of the mercy of God, but by the whole Church in the person of an individual, even though he be unworthy."[1] And Thomas Aquinas says: "The priest in consecrating the

[1] *Russia and the English Church*, by W. J. Birkbeck, chapter xxiii. *Essay on the Unity of the Church*, by A. S. Khomiakoff, p. 206.

Eucharist acts as the representative of the whole Church; it is as the representative of the Church that he utters the prayers."[1]

In the second place, the " form " of a Sacrament is a prayer. It is not that the priest uses certain words and " makes " the Sacrament, but that the whole Church prays, through its duly appointed ministers, that Christ will give us the spiritual food of His body and blood. The rules that the Church has made for the due ordering of the Sacrament are not the conditions of validity, but of regularity and order. The gift is from God in answer to the prayers of the Church. And all Christian tradition is in support of this. If you turn, for example, to the Gelasian Sacramentary, the earliest remaining service book of the Roman Church, you will find that the form of Absolution is a prayer for forgiveness. The form of Ordination is a prayer, and good theologians have doubted the validity of the English Order for the ordination of a deacon because there is no prayer immediately before the laying on of hands. In fact, there are some of our formulas which give the impression of being mechanical.

Then, thirdly, we have to remember another dictum of St. Thomas, that God is not bound or limited by Sacraments. The Sacraments are given to us as means to come to Him. They do not restrain His grace. So neither here nor elsewhere is there any exclusiveness of grace or exclusiveness of privilege.

I think if you realize these things, and make people realize them, the freedom of God's grace, and the gift that comes to us not through any power of the priest but by God's answer to the prayers of the Church, you will be able to make your people understand the reality and meaning of Sacraments. You will not ask them to believe what they cannot believe.

I have attempted in three directions to study the

[1] *Summa Theologiæ*, Pars iii., Quæst. LXXXII., Art. vii. Mr. Rawlinson in the book referred to above quotes these passages, but gives a wrong reference.

theology of the Church of England in relation to the theology of the Christian Church. During the last hundred years there has been a great revival of teaching on the Authority of the Church, on the doctrine of the Person of Christ, on the Sacraments. That revival has restored much that is true and vital to our teaching, but it has also tended to a good deal of rather imperfect theology—of a kind which does not commend itself to thoughtful people.

I would represent to you that in teaching the doctrines of Christianity it is necessary so to put your instruction that you may be believed. In the first place, following our Lord's example, we should begin with the ethical appeal. He preached the kingdom which was righteousness. "Seek ye first the kingdom of God and his righteousness." It is the characteristic, I think, of most English people that they approach religion on its ethical side, and although that will not be ultimately sufficient or satisfactory, it is the ethical appeal that they will understand.

Then next you must avoid dogmatic overstatement, or dogmatic elaboration. They do not appear to be real, and, in fact, they are not. Overstatement in old days of Calvinism on the doctrine of the Atonement, overstatement in more recent years of the doctrine of the Church and Sacrament, have defeated the purpose with which they were made. The extreme logical statement of a doctrine is never true, for it is only arrived at by eliminating factors.

The Church of England is always sober and balanced in its statements, and loyalty to the traditions of the Church of England will help us to state our beliefs in a way which will appeal to the thoughtful person of the present day.

CHAPTER IV

THE WORSHIP OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

I PROPOSE to-day to discuss with you the subject of the worship of the Church of England, and I shall begin with trying to lay down what I believe were the general aims of the Church in the reconstruction in the time of the Reformation.

What were the circumstances which the reformers had to meet? There prevailed throughout the country the mediæval system of Church worship; all the regular services in the Church were in the Latin language, although there might be a few services in English for the use of the people; they were carried out, at any rate in the cathedrals and great abbeys, with elaborate ceremonial; they were long and complicated, the music was elaborate and often tedious. There was little preaching except by the friars, and that not always of a very edifying character. The services in many of the parish churches were probably carried out in a slovenly and perfunctory way. A great complaint was that the Bishops did not preach. There was much which the growing enlightenment of the country was beginning to look upon as superstitious. There can be no doubt that for a long time there had been criticism of these services. They were felt by many not to satisfy their religious needs, to be tedious and unprofitable. On the other hand, as is always the case, there were those who were much attached to the traditional usage, and some of those, no doubt, who were absorbed in their liturgical services and worship felt in them an almost complete religious satisfaction. When Henry VIII., by asserting his authority as against that of the Pope, had opened the floodgates there was much stir in the country. The traditions of Lollardism, which had

never completely died out, were revived, sometimes in an extreme form, and the influence of the German Reformation spread throughout the country. The result was the beginning of a period of change, consisting to a large extent of periods of action followed by periods of reaction, until the coming in of the Prayer Book of 1662.

It must be noticed first that the Church of England has definitely declared its right to arrange its own services in its own way. This claim is expressed in the Thirty-fourth Article:

"Every particular or national Church hath authority to ordain, change, and abolish ceremonies or rites of the Church ordered only by man's authority, so that all things be done to edifying."

And if we turn to the contemporary literature we shall find that there is no point on which greater emphasis is laid. The right is asserted and developed with great skill. The aim of this period, in this as in other matters, was not to change the tradition, but to reform it by an appeal to the Scriptures and the teaching and usage of the primitive Church. It definitely refused to desert the traditional form of service on the one hand; on the other, its aim was to make the services more suitable and edifying. The principles that it adopted are clearly laid down for us in the Preface to the Prayer Book, and as we are engaged at present in the work of Prayer Book revision it may be as well that we should remind ourselves of them.

In the first place, the services were to be in the English language. This was definitely and explicitly asserted, and undoubtedly was a popular measure. The appeal is both to Scripture and to edification:

"Whereas St. Paul would have such language spoken to the people in the Church as they might understand and have profit by hearing the same; the service in this Church of England these many years hath been read in Latin to the people, which they understand not; so that they have heard with their ears only, and their heart, spirit, and mind have not been edified thereby."

NORWICH PUBLIC LIBRARIES

Secondly, the aim was to remove everything which was superstitious, to revise in accordance with the teaching of Scripture, and to appeal definitely to the Fathers of the Church. The standard they put forward was the Word of God and sound doctrine. The new Order for Prayer, it said, was—

"much more agreeable to the mind and purpose of the old Fathers, and a good deal more profitable and commodious, than that which of late was used. It is more profitable because here are left out many things, whereof some are untrue, some uncertain, some vain and superstitious. And nothing is ordained to be read but the very pure Word of God, the Holy Scriptures, or that which is agreeable to the same: and that in such a language and order as is most easy and plain for the understanding both of the readers and hearers."

Thirdly, the aim was to make this service simple, and one which could be followed and understood by the people. The old service books had been exceedingly complicated. The service had become very elaborate, so elaborate that it was difficult for most people to know exactly what should be said or done. There is always a tendency, when there are a number of persons to whom the carrying out of the services of the Church is the main business of their lives, that they should want to make the services more complicated and to them more interesting. They quite forget how difficult this service is to those outside. This becomes increasingly the case when the services are regulated by monastic bodies. This had been fully experienced, and so the rule is laid down:

"It is also more commodious both for the shortness thereof and for the plainness of the order, and for that the rules be few and easy."

Then, fourthly, the desire was to make one national use. It is well known that before the Reformation there were four different uses prevailing in different parts of England and Wales — Sarum, York, Hereford, and

Bangor. As long as this service was in Latin the difference probably did not matter very much, but as soon as the aim arose of creating a national Church and a service which every educated person at any rate could follow, a national use became necessary, so—

"now from henceforth all the whole Realm shall have but one use."

It is, I think, important for us to remember this at a time when, in a different way, it is suggested that there should be variety of use in the Church of England.

Let us then be quite clear. Our Church claims, and rightly claims, for it is dependent upon the whole position it has adopted, to have the authority to arrange and put forth for itself a national use; in doing this it has laid down certain great principles, and I should put before you very strongly that we are bound in loyalty to our Church to recognize its right and adhere to its principles. There are suggestions put forward at the present time that we should conform to the usage of the Western Patriarchate. Such a claim is, of course, absurd unless we are prepared to accept the authority of the Pope within each diocese. The fundamental principle of the Church of England is that that authority of the Pope is an usurped authority. We accept the doctrinal decrees of the whole Church; we recognize that it is right to conform to the common traditions of the Church. That is what our Prayer Book has done. Throughout no new tradition was created; our Communion Service is based upon the pre-Reformation liturgies. Everything that was essential was preserved, and the services were adapted to the people instead of to the clergy only. This position, the authority of our own Church, is that with which we start. I do not believe that there is anyone in this diocese who does not recognize the authority of the Church of England to settle its own affairs in these matters. I do not think there is anyone who is not completely loyal. At any rate, that I must take as our starting-point. This does

not mean that we may not have differences of opinion on many matters of detail; it does not mean that we may not desire to have some things changed in one direction or another; it does not mean that we assume any infallibility to ourselves or do not recognize that we may learn from the services and customs of other Churches; but it does mean that we recognize the competence of our Church to ordain its services for itself, that we intend loyally to adhere to its principles and to obey its directions, even when we disagree with them.

And may I add my own feeling of thankfulness for our national rite, and impress upon you that our attitude to-day should be one not only of loyalty, but of gratitude. I have made it my aim to become acquainted with the service of every Church in the East and West; I have constantly attended with care the services of the Orthodox and Separated Churches in the East and the Church of Rome; I know something of Lutheran, Presbyterian, and Nonconformist services; and I am not ashamed to confess my contentment and satisfaction with the services of the Church of England. In the services of the Roman Catholic Church, especially in some of those at which I have been present in France, there is often much that is impressive and solemn, but often they are interminably tedious, sometimes slovenly, and are felt burdensome by members of their own Church. However clever may be the defence made for the use of the Latin language, it is really indefensible. The complete absence of a congregational element divorces the people from the services, and there is always the impression that they are the concern of the clergy and not of the whole Church. Tradition is a good thing, but the Roman services are often too antiquarian. When an attempt is made to make them popular they become sometimes gaudy and undignified—a failing which may be found in some of the imitations of them in our own Church. The faults of Nonconformist services are of a very different kind. In the hands of an able minister they may become impressive, but they are too much dependent on his

personal capacity. At their best they really get hold of the people, but they always have a tendency to become undignified and even irreverent. We may learn much in both directions. We have learnt much from them, indeed, in recent years. I do not, as I say, think that our services are in any way perfect. We have our own difficulties about them, and we ought to be continually prepared to learn, but I am quite convinced that for disloyalty to our Prayer Book we have no cause.

We now come to a difficulty which is felt by many as to what ought to be the rule of the Church which they are to follow. The Prayer Book was drawn up nearly 400 years ago; the present revision is nearly 300 years old. Some parts of it are obsolete; some things in it are difficult, and, as a matter of fact, no one follows it completely. What, then, should be our standard? Now this plea can be put forward in an honest way or a dishonest way. In an honest way if there is a real desire to know what we ought to do; in a dishonest way if it is simply made an excuse for unlimited self-will. The latter class I propose to ignore throughout my charge; the former I propose to help as much as I can.

The principal liturgical officer of each diocese is the Bishop. In the early days of the Church he had, we might hold, almost unlimited authority, but this gradually became restrained by the customs of the local Church as they grew up, and by the gradual growth of a common Church custom to which each Church tended more and more to conform. Then came the development of more regular rules, canons of councils whether provincial or œcumenical, and the growth of a traditional service. Then came the development of the canon law in the West and the building up of the service of the Mass. Right up to the Reformation, there was still a considerable amount of local and provincial autonomy. In the Church of England at the present time the liturgical authority of the Bishop is limited by his oath of canonical obedience to the Archbishop, which includes, of course, obligation to obey all the canons of the Church, and his duty of

adherence to the laws and customs of the Church of England as laid down in the Prayer Book and other authorized documents.

The principal liturgical authority of the Church of England is, of course, the Prayer Book, and the Prayer Book we have to obey, but in obeying that our action must be to a certain extent modified by custom and use. Without attempting to define what is meant by desuetude we may, I think, take it as quite definite that a canon or custom of the Church which has fallen into disuse gradually ceases to be binding, except in so far as this is modified by an Act of Parliament, a point which I shall discuss later. Anything in the Prayer Book which has definitely and clearly become obsolete is not, it seems to me, binding. Gradually a certain custom grows up. We may, I think, claim the authority of custom for omitting the exhortations in the Communion Office. Then, on the other hand, customs which have become fairly well established may gradually claim the authority of usage —for example, the use of hymns in our services. At the time of the Oxford revival many changes were made in our services which, at first, were held to be irregular, if not illegal; it was considered, for example, improper to have surplice choirs in parish churches; but gradually these customs asserted themselves, and whether they may be wise or not they have the authority of usage. I think, then, that the authority which we are to follow will be the Prayer Book as modified by well-established custom, and the guidance in matters of doubt belongs to the Bishop, with the right of appeal to the Archbishop. This is clearly laid down for us in the Preface to the Prayer Book:

"The parties that so doubt, or diversely take anything, shall alway resort to the Bishop of the Diocese, who by his discretion shall take order for the quieting and appeasing of the same; so that the same order be not contrary to anything contained in this Book. And if the Bishop of the Diocese be in doubt, then he may send for the resolution thereof to the Archbishop."

The Bishop must not order anything contrary to the Prayer Book, or even in addition to the Prayer Book, but he may allow and recognize those things which custom has established, and he may give permission for what is not inconsistent with the Prayer Book. It must, in fact, be recognized that no stereotyped service can ever be imposed upon a Church, particularly in times of religious activity. The greater part of the services of our Church have been built up, not by canons or legal enactments, but by the gradual growth of custom, and if the creative spirit of the Church is guided and controlled by wise ordinances and the discretion of its officers, it will continue to create in a healthy way new forms of worship adapted to the changed needs of the times.

Let us now in this light examine the present situation. There are, we have seen, three tendencies in the Church of England at the present day, traditional, modernist or critical, and evangelical, and all three represent legitimate developments of the Christian spirit. In all religions there is a strong conservative element, but our religion must not be inconsistent with our instincts and beliefs. Our religious worship soon becomes unreal if it does not respond to religious experience. The traditional side of our nature aims at bringing the services of the Church into harmony with the historical form of service. It generally aims at the development of ceremonial, and would make the external acts of worship a powerful element in teaching and fostering our religious sense. The modernist represents the critical spirit; he is always concerned with being quite certain that what he says is true; he is on his guard against what is stereotyped and may be false, and what has come down from the past. He wishes to appeal to the intellectual side of human nature, and is always fearing that what is external and traditional may suppress what is true. The evangelical is moved by the strength of his religious experience. He desires simplicity in form; he wishes the spirit to work untrammelled; he fears that externalism may not express, but stifle, religious feeling.

Now, as I have said, all these are legitimate and natural developments of the religious spirit. They must all be represented in our Church; if any side is suppressed it will ultimately lead to a breach of unity which will make religious life ineffectual, and will lessen the strength of its appeal. For instance, the refusal of the Church of Rome to take due account of the intellectual needs of the day hampers its work. Not only are all these tendencies legitimate in a Church, but they are all tendencies which exist, though in varying degrees, in almost every individual, and unless all the different aspects of our religious life are sufficiently responded to we shall feel the want of inspiration in our Church and its services. We are all naturally conservative; we all tend to be irritated when we find what we have been accustomed to is altered and changed. We are irritated if the services are performed in a slovenly way. We have a natural respect for tradition, although in varying degrees. Then, again, most men are irritated when they hear things in church which appear to them to be obviously untrue. Most men, again, become dissatisfied if the services are dry and dull and do not respond or make any appeal to their heart or to their spirit. We get tired of what is commonplace. We want some novelty which appeals to new inclinations and movements. We have to be careful, then, that at the present day we should respond to all these tendencies. As the Church of England at the Reformation tried to preserve a due mean between the traditional, the intellectual, and the emotional element, so we must adapt our services to the needs of the times.

Now the result of all these tendencies has been that there is considerable variety in the services of the Church of England, and this is acquiesced in. Attempts have been made from time to time by State action to produce uniformity. These attempts have failed because public opinion has not supported them. The geat majority of the members of the Church of England are not prepared to see a clergyman imprisoned or turned out of his living for variations in the manner of conducting a service,

especially when it is found that these appeal to a considerable section of the people. Moreover, although, as I have said, the great body of the clergy are entirely loyal, they are not prepared to submit to the authority of the Bishop when they consider his action is *ultra vires*, and the courts to which appeal is made are looked upon as unconstitutional. They do not feel under those circumstances that in refusing obedience they are not loyal. Whether they are really loyal or not will ultimately depend upon the question whether public opinion, that is the general voice of the Church finally, endorses the soundness of their attitude.

Not only is this variety acquiesced in; it is generally recognized to be beneficial. It is felt that there are differences of temperament which demand different types of services, and that if a national Church is to unite all the people of the country in the unity of one society, then there must be the possibility of considerable variety of religious expression. If there had been greater variety at the time of the Reformation, and if the attempt had not been made to impose uniformity by civil authority, the many schisms that have taken place might not have occurred, and the Church might still be really united. What was true then is probably still more true now, for the greater variety of modern life and the greater intellectual element in the lives of most of the people will inevitably tend to a demand for greater variety in religious ordinances.

But if there is to be this variety it must be limited in two directions. There must, on the one side, be recognized limits beyond which variety is not allowed, and there must be some means by which the services in any particular place shall not be out of harmony with the desires of the people. I think that the former will readily be recognized and acquiesced in by the great majority of people if once freedom is recognized, and I hope that it may always be possible to secure a substantial basis of unity without having recourse to any methods of coercion. The second demands more care. It should be the aim of

every parish priest to adapt the Church services to the needs of the people of his parish to the best of his ability, and to work in harmony with his people in the organization of the services of the Church. To that end I would clearly lay down that, in my opinion, it is the duty of a clergyman when he is first appointed to a parish to make the local tradition his starting-point, and not change anything of importance hastily or without consulting the Church meeting and the parochial Church Council; to explain the meaning and purpose of all changes that he wishes to make, and to be slow rather than rapid in introducing any novelty. A vigorous High-Churchman of the old school, Dr. Hook, Vicar of Leeds, who found himself faced with strong Puritan traditions, transformed the services of the Leeds Parish Church by adopting the principle of never making any changes until such time as the people themselves asked for them. He, of course, prepared the way by his teaching, and people felt that his teaching was reasonable. Such wisdom should be our model.

Let me take a concrete example. Supposing a newly-appointed parish priest desires to adopt what are called the Eucharistic vestments, of which I shall speak shortly; or again, supposing he desires to give them up—and either policy is one which, at the present time, I can conceive existing—he ought to act with circumspection and considerateness; he should explain his reasons, he should talk the matter over with all those concerned; he should be ready to adopt a temporizing policy; he should aim at making the action which he proposes to take, whichever it may be, the action of the great majority of his people and not merely himself, and if he finds that what he proposes is definitely contrary to public desire, he should be prepared to yield. In particular, great consideration should be displayed in country parishes where the population is dependent upon a single church, and where tradition is often more tenacious than in towns.

I would conclude this section of my subject with emphasizing to you my strong opinion that in the Church of

England there should be freedom and the possibility of variety in our services, but that this freedom has disadvantages, and that it should be used always with self-restraint, wisdom, and consideration for others.

I now propose, in accordance with the principles that I have laid down, to deal with particular services, and those questions of the day on which I think I ought to express my opinion. I shall begin with the question of the Eucharistic vestments, and with regard to these I propose to ask two questions: Are they legal, and are they desirable ?

It would not, I think, be profitable if I were to occupy your time with discussing in detail the Ornaments Rubric, but I would like to give you my own conclusions. We have to recognize, to begin with, as regards the legal question, that the actual law depends upon a judgment, which has not been overruled, according to which the Eucharistic vestments are not legal. That judgment was received at the time that it was delivered with considerable dissatisfaction. There was strong ground for thinking that it was a judgment of policy rather than of law. It has never carried any moral weight with those who differed from it, and no Bishop at the present time attempts to enforce it, while various authorities whose opinions are of real value (among them your late Bishop, Dr. Gibson) have expressed grounds for thinking that the judgment was mistaken. With that opinion I agree. I have read with much care what has been written on this subject, and I cannot feel that there is any real force in the arguments which have been used condemning the vestments.

Let me state briefly the facts. In the Act of Uniformity of Queen Elizabeth, issued in 1559, the use of the second Prayer Book of Edward VI. is enjoined with certain variations, but whereas that Prayer Book enjoined the surplice and surplice only, this Act specially ended with the enactment:

" That such ornaments of the church and of the ministers thereof shall be retained and be in use, as was in the Church of England by authority of Parliament, in

the second year of the reign of King Edward the Sixth, until other order shall be therein taken by the authority of the Queen's Majesty, with the advice of her Commissioners appointed and authorized under the Great Seal of England for Causes Ecclesiastical or of the Metropolitan of the Realm."

This direction was inserted in the Prayer Book of 1559 as follows:

"And here it is to be noted that the Minister at the time of the Communion and at all other times in his ministration shall use such ornaments in the Church as were in use by authority of Parliament in the second year of the reign of King Edward the Sixth according to the Act of Parliament in the beginning of this book."

Two questions have been raised about this rubric. The first is, Does it refer to the ornaments used before the first Prayer Book of Edward VI. or to those enjoined by that book? As to this point all authorities of any value are agreed that it refers to the first Prayer Book—that is to say, to the Prayer Book which was issued with the authority of Parliament, and the attempt to make it apply to what existed before that Prayer Book was issued has received no support. The first Prayer Book definitely enjoins the use of the cope, or vestment, and that would imply that the use of these was legal.

The second question is, Was other order of the kind specially laid down taken? It must be noted that it is definitely defined to be an order issued by the Queen with the support either of the Commissioners or of the Metropolitan. Now it has been argued that certain advertisements issued in 1566 ordering the surplice were "other order," but what is quite clear about them is that they not only had not the authority of the Queen, but that when pressed she refused to give her authority to them. It is argued again by the lawyers that we must assume that such other order was taken because the vestments were disused and given up, and we must presume that the action of various commissioners in pressing this must have been

legal. There is no doubt that action contrary to this rubric did take place, but there is no evidence that the injunctions under which this was done conformed to what was demanded by the rubric.

It seems to me that what happened was something different. The original policy of the Queen was in favour of retaining the vestments. This accorded with her own religious desires and customs, and moreover she would have looked upon it as the best means of preserving the unity of the Church of England. If changes could be made to satisfy the reforming spirit with no change made in the external forms of service, it might be possible to unite the different sections of the community in the Church. But, as a matter of fact, the state of the nation was different from what it had been at the beginning of the reign of Edward VI., or even at the end of that reign. The party of reform which had been suppressed during Mary's reign had become more violent and enthusiastic in consequence. Moreover, it was reinforced by the returned exiles from the Continent, and they became at once the most assertive element in the Church. It soon became apparent that the question was not whether the vestments would be retained, but whether the surplice even could be retained, so the efforts of the authorities were devoted to the retaining of the surplice. Advertisements were issued enjoining the use of the surplice, but the Act was left unchanged and no order was taken to change it. Vestments, therefore, remained legal by Act of Parliament, but it was not possible to enforce the Act, and they fell into disuse. The result was that the more conservative elements in the Church gradually separated themselves, and the hope that Elizabeth might have had of uniting the great body of the people was to that extent disappointed.

But there is a further point. When the Prayer Book was revised in 1662 the rubric was again included without any words suggesting that other order should be taken:

"And here is to be noted that such ornaments of the Church and of the Ministers thereof at all times of their

ministration shall be retained and be in use as were in the Church of England by the authority of Parliament in the Second Year of the Reign of King Edward the Sixth."

I cannot hold that the omission of the words "until other order be taken," and so on, means, "Except in so far as other order has been taken." If that had been meant it would have been explicitly stated. Nor can I hold that the words do not mean what they say. It may be further noted that long before the use of the vestments was revived—at a time, in fact, when such a revival was not even thought of—it was recognized that this rubric meant what it said, and it was only in obedience to what was believed to be public opinion that another interpretation was given to the words.

I, therefore, hold that by Act of Parliament the vestments are enjoined in the Church of England.

But now I pass to another point. The Prayer Book has for a loyal Churchman the authority of a canon or ecclesiastical law drawn up and accepted by the proper ecclesiastical authority, and therefore demanding our obedience; but it is recognized that an ecclesiastical law or custom ceases to be binding if it fall into desuetude, and cannot be revived except by proper authority. Now the Eucharistic vestments were entirely disused in the Church for a century and a half after the last revision of the Prayer Book, and their use has never been enjoined by any ecclesiastical authority. I should hold, therefore, that, ecclesiastically speaking, they are in the Church of England incorrect. It seems to me, therefore, that by the law of the State vestments are enjoined; by the law of the Church there is no authority for their use.

But even this is not the whole matter. During the last hundred years their use has been revived. There are now a considerable number of churches in England in which they are used. They are used, for example, in seventy-five churches in this diocese. They are used in at least one cathedral, they are used by Bishops, diocesan and others. In certain Colonial dioceses they have become the recognized use. Although there has been much

opposition to this revival, and efforts have been made from time to time to check it, it is continually going on. The use has spread because, I think, those who have desired to make use of the vestments are more determined than the mass of the people who are opposed to them. The situation, then, with which we have to deal, is really this. We are not concerned with the question whether the vestments are legal or not by statute law, or whether this originally was carried out quite correctly. We are confronted with the situation that actually exists —that while in a number of churches at the present time the use of vestments exists, and has in some cases existed for more than half a century, on the other hand there are many churches in which they are not used. There is, in fact, a double custom prevailing in the Church at the present time. Both sides feel that their action is just and right, and we cannot, as far as practical action is concerned, go behind that opinion. Both customs prevail. The important question for us now to ask is, Which of them is the more edifying ?

The two main arguments for the use of Eucharistic vestments are tradition and the beauty and dignity of the service. It is maintained that although they are not primitive, and in fact are really only the ordinary dress of a gentleman of the fourth or fifth century preserved, beautified, and made formal, yet they have in fact been in use for more than one thousand years, and in some form or other are the dress proper for the service of the Eucharist among the great majority of Christians. It is maintained, further, that that service, being the most solemn and sacred in the Church, should be beautified in every way by special vestments and by outward forms, and that we should enrich the worship of the Church by everything that would help in making that service impressive. The wealth, the richness, the colour of the vestments, the symbolism of the service, are full of edification. The richness of Eucharistic worship is contrasted with the coldness of a more puritan service.

The main argument against their use is that they

embody a doctrine inconsistent with the Church of England; that the chasuble is described in the Roman Ordination service as the *vestis sacerdotalis*,[1] and that they, therefore, bring with them a theory of the ministry and of the sacrifice of the Mass which the Church of England has deliberately set aside. It may, however, be pointed out that as they are used also in the Swedish Church, such a meaning is not necessary; that a vestment has its meaning given to it by the form of service and the teaching of the Church, and that it does not bring a doctrine to the Church, and that the two questions are really quite independent. What may be definitely recognized is that a special vestment does enhance the importance of the Eucharistic service.

In favour of the surplice, on the other hand, it may be argued that it is the use and custom of the English Church; that the English Church in this, as in other matters, has a right to have its own customs; that the simpler service harmonizes better with the genius of the English people; that in the most sacred and solemn of our services simplicity is more suitable than richness of attire, and that an excessive amount of decoration and of externalism is not really an aid for worship. It distracts the mind from sacred things and diminishes rather than increases the solemnity of the action.

If I may express my own opinion, it is quite decidedly in favour of the surplice. I have attended, not without edification, many services in which the Eucharistic vestments are used, both in our own Church and in others, but to me the dignified simplicity of the white surplice harmonizes better with the whole character of this service. I agree that it appeals more to the great body of Englishmen and responds better to their deeper religious feelings. The objections which are so widely felt to the use of vestments do not arise from prejudice or thought-

[1] It is interesting to notice that the sacerdotal idea implied is not the power of the priest, but charity. *Accipe vestem Sacerdotalem, per quam caritas intelligitur : potens est enim Deus, ut augeat tibi caritatem, et opus perfectum.*

lessness, but respond to the deeper instincts of the people.

The position now is one in which the ultimate use of the Church must be settled by the gradual development of public opinion. The question can no longer be discussed merely by an appeal to local or antiquarian regulations. Both uses at the present time prevail in the Church, both have become legal by prescription. My directions are that no one should introduce any change in this matter in the parish in which he is working, contrary to the expressed opinion of his people. We must allow the mind of the Church gradually to form itself.

Let me now say something about the dress of the Bishop. The rubric in the first Prayer Book was:

"And whensoever the Bishop shall celebrate the Holy Communion in the church or execute any other public administration, he shall have upon him, besides his rochet, a surplice, or alb, and a cope or vestment, and also his pastoral staff in his hand, or else borne or holden by his chaplain."

The advertisements of 1566 say nothing as to the dress of a Bishop, but they do as to what is to be worn in the Cathedral.

"In the ministration of Holy Communion in Cathedrals and Collegiate churches, the principal Minister shall wear a cope, with Gospeller and Epistoler agreeably, and at all other prayers to be said at the Communion Table, to use no cope but surplice."

This is further enjoined by the canons of 1604 which referred to the advertisements.

It would, therefore, appear to me that as regards the Bishop clearly no further order has been taken. By the law of the land the Bishop is required to wear the traditional vestments; by ecclesiastical law they have fallen into disuse and become unauthorized. As regards mitres, I do not know of any definite Anglican authority for their use. In recent years the custom of wearing a cope at other places than in cathedrals, and a mitre, or a

cope without a mitre, has been introduced, and it may be held that the cope being used at coronations has never fallen into disuse. The use of the Bishop's vestments has also been revived, but less commonly, although in some Colonial churches full and complete vestments are worn.

I would like to express the same opinion about the Bishop's vestments as about the priest's vestments. We must recognize that a twofold custom prevails, that we cannot consider either the one or the other as illegal on any grounds which will carry general consent until definite legislation by the Church and State combined is undertaken, and that the question has really become, Which is the most edifying ?

Now to some the cope and mitre or the Eucharistic vestments with the mitre appear dignified and suitable ornaments; to others, and I think at present a large number, they look somewhat tawdry and even ridiculous, and they suggest associations with aspects of the Bishop's office that are not liked. My own feeling in this, as in other matters, is that the simpler use is the more impressive; that there is a simple dignity about the traditional dress which harmonizes better with the instincts of the English people. In this, as in other matters, I hope that in process of time a common public opinion will be allowed to develop itself.

I come now to a question of great importance. What should be the character of the principal morning services in our churches ? Both rubric and custom have until recently enjoined that the Morning Service on Sundays should consist of Morning Prayer, Litany, and Ante-Communion Service, followed on some occasions by the remainder of the Communion Service. Two causes have led to a change. The one is the desire to shorten the service, a desire which has been strengthened by the over-elaboration and tediousness of much of the music; the other is the desire to make a Choral Celebration of the Holy Eucharist analogous to the service of the Mass, the principal and most important service of the day. The

second motive has prevailed since the beginning of the ritualistic movement; in some churches in recent years it has been pressed with an increasing ardour and some want of toleration by many of the younger clergy and some of the Bishops.

Let us at any rate be clear. The question is not a legal one. Provided Morning Prayer, the Litany and the Ante-Communion Service are said on Sunday the law is fulfilled. It is quite legal to say Morning Prayer without music or with music, and to celebrate the Holy Communion with music or without music. There is no law to prevent non-communicating attendance at the Holy Communion provided there are three communicants and provided that no one is repelled from Communion. The question is one of religious feeling and edification. As regards the history of this service, there can be no doubt that from the earliest days of the Church the celebration of the Holy Communion has been the principal service on Sunday morning, but that custom may be fulfilled quite well even if it is celebrated at eight o'clock in the morning without the accompaniment of music. It is a question quite arguable that the more sacred and important the service the less music there should be. There are many who would feel that music was something much more suitable for the more popular service, and that a dramatic development of the Communion Service takes away from its reality and impressiveness.

I will now consider the nature and meaning of this service. It is maintained that the meaning of the Reformation is that it substituted the Communion Service for the Mass, thus returning to the custom and teaching of the primitive Church, and that the reintroduction of the Choral Celebration in the place of Morning Prayer aims at restoring the Mass with all the erroneous teaching associated with it. To deal with this fully would, of course, require much more space than I can give it, but I believe that it is possible shortly to emphasize some well-known points about which there is no real doubt. Two things are quite clear—that the Eucharist was, in the early

days of the Church, a service of communion, and that it was called a sacrifice; but it is equally certain that the word "sacrifice" had not the very specialized meaning that it came to have in mediæval theology. It might be used for any religious rite; it could be used definitely of the offering of the sacrifice, which we preserve in our service, or of the sacrificial meal; it does not seem specifically to refer to the immolation of the victim; and no conception of the Eucharist then prevailed which made it take the place of the sacrifice on Calvary. It is equally certain that in the Middle Ages, as in the modern Roman Catholic Church, the sacrificial aspect of the Mass has been developed at the expense of the Communion, and that a meaning has been given to the service of the Mass which conflicts with the uniqueness of the sacrifice on Calvary and assigns to the service a mechanical efficacy which seems to have no relation to the original institution of the Eucharist. There is no doubt, then, that the Reformers did desire to make a change, that they did desire to restore the Communion, that they did intend to go back to the customs of the early Church and ideas more in accordance with Scripture. All this seems to me to be certain.

On the other hand, there are, I think, two points in their action which have been misrepresented. The first is when it is argued that the first Prayer Book of Edward VI. represents the Mass, the second the Communion, and that the change is made between these two Prayer Books. I do not think that this is true. The office for Communion had been issued before the first Prayer Book, and the first Prayer Book has itself a definite office for Communion introduced into the service. The essential change was made before the first Prayer Book was issued. Then secondly, I think that the antithesis between Mass and Communion is exaggerated. Mass is the same service as Communion, although to a certain extent wrongly interpreted. The important point for us to remember is that it is not our service but the Lord's service, and even if those who take part in it misunderstand it, it still remains

the service that He instituted. This principle will work in either direction. We cannot say that there is a real difference between the Mass and the Communion. We cannot, on the other hand, say that a service of the Lord's Supper celebrated by one with Zwinglian views is not the service that our Lord instituted. The service is the same in all cases, however wrongly we may interpret or use it.

The service should always be a service of communion, but that does not, in my opinion, take away from other aspects or minimize its full significance. The officiating minister in this service, acting on behalf of the Church, commemorates the sacrifice once offered, and Christ Himself is, we believe, present in response to our prayers, "Himself the Victim and Himself the Priest." Let me quote here some remarkable words of Dr. Moule, afterwards Bishop of Durham, which he spoke at a conference at Fulham:

"I believe that if our eyes, like those of Elisha's servant at Dothan, were opened to the unseen, we should indeed behold our Lord present at our Communions. There and then, assuredly, if anywhere and at any time, He remembers His promise: 'Where two or three are gathered together in my Name, there am I in the midst of them.' Such special presence, the promised congregational presence, is perfectly mysterious in mode, but absolutely true in fact: no creation of our imagination or emotions, but an object for our faith. I believe that our Lord so present, not *on* the Holy Table, but *at* it, would be seen Himself in our presence, to bless the Bread and Wine for a holy use, and to distribute them to His disciples, saying to all and each: *Take, eat, this is my Body which is given for you. Drink ye all of this; this is my Blood of the New Covenant which was shed for you for the remission of sins.* I believe that we should worship Him thus present in the midst of us in His living grace, with unspeakable reverence, thanksgiving, joy, and love. We should revere the Bread and the Wine with a profound sense of their sacredness as given by Him in physical assurance of our joyful part, as believers in Him, and so as members of Him, in all the benefits of His Passion. Receiving them, while beholding Him, we should, through

them as His equivalent signs of His once sacrificed Body and Blood, take deep into us a fresh certainty of our perfect acceptance in Him our Sacrifice, and also of our mystical union with Him as He, once dead, now lives for us and in us, thus feeding on Him in the heart, by faith, with thanksgiving. Receiving His signs, we should look up with renewed and inexpressible confidence through Him to the Father.

"I do not think that the Holy Scriptures give us reason to believe that this sacred procedure (which we cannot see, but which is truly present to faith) involves any special attachment of His Presence to the sacred Signs, albeit called His Body and His Blood by reason of their equivalence as divine Tokens."

Now, I do not quote these words because I agree with them entirely, but because they seem to me to justify the custom of our Church. If we believe that the Holy Communion is a service of thanksgiving for the life and death of Jesus Christ and His redemption of the world; if in it we commemorate that death and sacrifice; if in it Jesus Christ is Himself spiritually present among us, I think we shall quite understand why it has become the great service of Christian worship, the greatest service of worship in the Christian Church, in whatever way we may celebrate it. Every celebration, then, of the Holy Communion should, I believe, be a Communion, but not necessarily for all who are present. At an ordination it is a Communion for all those who have been ordained; at a wedding for the bride and bridegroom and perhaps their nearest relatives only; at a celebration in commemoration of the departed for the nearest friends, but that is no reason why others should not be present at this service. So at a parish celebration some should communicate, but not all need.

I would pass then to the practical question. In my visitation questions I particularly asked about the Choral Celebration, and I was impressed with the answers. There are about 126 churches in the diocese in which there is a choral celebration in some form or other. The majority of the clergy seem to be agreed that Morning

Prayer is the best ordinary service for their people. Some who probably might desire something different say quite clearly that they do not think their people are ready for a choral celebration as the ordinary service on a Sunday. My own observation would entirely agree with that; I am sure that for the ordinary congregation on Sunday morning in most churches, the traditional custom of the English Church is the best. The Morning Service has greater variety and conveys a larger element of instruction; it is simpler and easier of comprehension. More than that, the great majority of the more devout would prefer their Communion to be something separate and solemn, and if they attend a celebration in the early morning they would like a different service later in the day. Then, on the other hand, there are a certain number who would lay immense stress, at any rate for some people, on the Eucharistic service. There are some now who would press it with great vehemence as being the one thing which would bring people back to church, and in some parishes there is a choral celebration which is very fully attended. There is no doubt that the appeal is different in different places. I certainly know many parishes where the introduction of the Holy Communion as a substitute for Mattins has alienated great bodies of the people. Nor is it the case that ultimately people are taught to like it. Some who have been attracted by it at first definitely come back to preferring the old-fashioned Morning Service.

There is another problem which is facing us at the present time. It is becoming increasingly doubtful whether the old-fashioned hours of eight and eleven are the most suitable for Divine Service. Eleven o'clock was the hour selected to suit the comfortable habits of our English upper classes; eight o'clock was the hour for the new element of self-discipline introduced among the country squires and parsons by the Oxford Movement; but for people of other classes these hours are inconvenient. Eight o'clock is exactly the time of the family breakfast; eleven is so late that it is impossible for the

service to be attended, as an earlier service might be, by those who have the household dinner to cook. In some parishes the custom has arisen of a choral celebration at 9.30 or 10, which is found to be popular, at any rate, to a section of the congregation, followed by Morning Prayer in the old-fashioned way at eleven. It is quite clear that in many ways we are in a transition period. Old customs have been broken up, new customs and habits are being formed, and it is the duty of every parish priest to consider carefully what is best for his people and what his people feel is best for them. There was a time when the canonical hour for Morning Service was nine o'clock. Customs have changed in the past, and they may change again. Only let us be quite clear that we do what is for the spiritual good of the people.

My directions are as follows: In every parish there should be Morning Prayer said at an hour suitable for the people, with a suitable amount of music. Exceptions may be made, especially in those parishes where it is customary to have a plain Mattins followed by a choral Eucharist, and where those who desire the other use may usually find it in some neighbouring church. Secondly, where it is found suitable and convenient and the circumstances of the parish allow it, there may be a Eucharistic Service at 9.30 or 10. Thirdly, in places where it is desired generally or occasionally to have choral celebration of the Holy Communion as part of the ordinary Morning Service, I am prepared to authorize, provided it is agreeable to the people, that Morning Prayer should be said as far as the Benedictus, and should then be followed by the Eucharist and a sermon. The Creed and the Collect will not be said or sung twice, and I do not think there is anything lost in the omission of the Apostles' Creed when the Nicene Creed follows. Psalms, Canticles, and Lessons for the day may be considered a suitable introduction for the Communion Service, and the service will not be unduly lengthy. In such a case no difficulty should be made about those who desire to leave the church after the sermon. I think that in this way, in a parish where

there is but one church and where it is obviously impossible for the clergyman to have many services, the desires of both classes of people in the parish will be met.

There are some other smaller difficulties which might arise, and one is the difficulty with regard to the Litany. There is, I think, an increasing feeling on the one side of the great beauty of the Litany, on the other side that when added to the rest of the Morning Service it often becomes heavy and therefore unprofitable. The Litany must be said, as the Prayer Book directs, every Sunday, but I think more and more we should aim at using it as a service by itself, or sometimes as an introduction to a Communion Service. It becomes most impressive when it is used in an impressive way.

Let me conclude with a few general directions. The period is undoubtedly one of transition. On the one hand, the more or less enforced attendance at church by people whether they like it or not has almost entirely died out except in places where old-fashioned views prevail. On the other hand, the desire for religious services and interest in them has probably increased amongst a section of our people, but they demand that the sermons should be interesting and the services should be edifying. It is your duty, the duty of all who are interested in the wellbeing of the Church, to devote all your care and attention to making the services as good as you possibly can. You must preserve its traditional character, for people are conservative in matters of religion. You must by diligent attention to your sermon make it an appeal to the intellectual demands of your people, and however you order your services you must make them respond to and call forth the reality of religious experience.

CHAPTER V

THE WORSHIP OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND AND THE REVISION OF THE PRAYER BOOK

In the portion of my charge that I delivered yesterday I tried to illustrate the genius and character of the Church of England as expressed in its worship. I pointed out that it was in its essence a reform of the traditional worship of the pre-Reformation Church, and that in that reform there had been exhibited a respect for antiquity and a desire to conform to the teaching of the old Fathers and the Scriptures; that the purpose of the revision was to attain greater simplicity; to make the service comprehensible to the congregation as well as to the ministers; that its aim was the edification of the people. I suggested to you also that the simple dignity of the Church of England was more in harmony with our religious point of view than a too elaborate ceremonial. I am going to-day further to illustrate the characteristics of the teaching of the Church of England by another point —the absence throughout of rigid rules or regulations.

There is a natural tendency in the human mind to demand definite direction. If once the desire to do what is right is formed the question is asked, What is right? To many, at any rate, it is a great relief that they can be given a definite rule which they are to keep and which will be satisfactory. That is the principle of the Law. In contrast with that is the principle of the Gospel, which means freedom and initiative, which passes beyond definite rule and makes definite rule unnecessary by a transformation of the spirit and the direction of the conscience. No doubt for those who are unfit for it such a state of freedom has its dangers. It may easily become

Antinomianism—each man thinks that he will do what is right in his own eyes. Again, it is found by some to be a burden. The responsibility is too great. So they seek to go back to the old state of legal rule or enactment. There is always a danger of such retrogression, and it may take either of two forms: it may take what is called the Catholic or the Protestant. Protestant legalism shows itself in the revival of more than Jewish regulations with regard to the keeping of Sunday and the forbidding of many innocent pleasures through the fear that pleasure may lead to a breach of morality. Catholic legalism takes the form of strict ecclesiastical rule; of an attempt to regulate the whole of a man's life by ecclesiastical authority; of imposing upon him a rule of the Church which he is expected to accept and obey without thinking. Both these tendencies have existed at different times in the Church of England and are represented at the present day by different parties in the Church, and both these tendencies are, it seems to me, inconsistent with the teaching of the Gospel and the genius of the Church of England.

Let me take two or three instances, and first of all the principle of Confession. There had gradually grown up in the Church a custom and rule of compulsory private confession. It is interesting to notice the way in which the Church of England treated this rule. It quite clearly recognized the value of confession, as the exhortation in the Prayer Book shows:

"And because it is requisite, that no man should come to the holy Communion, but with a full trust in God's mercy, and with a quiet conscience; therefore if there be any of you, who by this means cannot quiet his own conscience herein, but requireth further comfort or counsel, let him come to me, or to some other discreet and learned minister of God's Word, and open his grief; that by the ministry of God's holy Word he may receive the benefit of absolution, together with ghostly counsel and advice, to the quieting of his conscience, and avoiding of all scruple and doubtfulness."

Confession is here regarded as the right and proper remedy in a case of a burdened conscience, and the Church of England recognizes fully the value of absolution, which it authorizes its clergy to pronounce. This authorization of confession is not only in full accordance with the tradition of the Christian Church, but harmonizes with all the teaching of modern psychology. Every clergyman in the Church of England should be ready and prepared to exercise this ministry, and every clergyman ought so to conduct himself in his parish and before his people that it would be natural for them to come to him in such emergency and difficulty to confess their sins, to obtain his advice and direction, and, on the exhibition of true penitence, to obtain the authoritative declaration of absolution and of the divine forgiveness of sins.

But there are two further extensions of the custom which some would desire to introduce: the one is compulsory confession, the other is habitual confession. I do not think that there is much demand for authorizing compulsory confession in the Church of England, but I do know that much pressure is sometimes brought upon people to make them go to confession, and, in particular, pressure is brought upon candidates for Confirmation to go to confession before they are confirmed. No doubt to some this may seem a reasonable thing to do. They would think it right to say: " You are making a new start in life; you are going now to make an effort to live in accordance with God's law as a good Christian. Would it not be good for you, as you are making a new start, to make a clean breast, to confess your past life, to obtain absolution and the assurance of forgiveness of your sins? This will make it easier for you to lead a new life." No doubt there are cases where this may be right and wise; no doubt in some cases there may have been things which have been concealed which had better be revealed to someone. If confession is, in such a case, resorted to voluntarily, it may be good. Often, too, those who are to be confirmed have difficulties on which they wish for help. All this is in favour in certain cases of voluntary

confession, but it is not in favour of any rule of compulsion. Your aim should be so to train your candidates for Confirmation, not that they get accustomed to rely upon the help or direction of anyone, but that they learn to obey their own conscience and to keep their own conscience clean. It is your business at Confirmation so to train the boys and girls that you send out into the world, not that they may conform to your directions, or the directions of any other priest, but that they may have learnt to do right and not wrong, and to fulfil God's will, and to rely upon the guidance of their own trained conscience. That is a far higher ideal, and it is the Christian ideal.

There is another custom I must speak about, and that is habitual or regular confession. It is, I think, clear that if any man or woman desires habitually to go to a priest for confession, for absolution and direction, there is nothing contrary to the teaching of the Church of England in that, provided no improper pressure or undue persuasion is used to promote the practice. At the same time, it is somewhat of an extension of the directions in the Prayer Book. Now, I am quite willing to allow that there may be a certain number of persons to whom some such assistance is helpful and desirable, because they have not the strength to keep themselves on the right course without help and direction. In that case our duty is to do our best, not to make them dependent upon our administrations, but to give them strength to walk alone; for I am quite convinced that any habit of habitual confession is really an inferior method. There are some people, I believe, who would press for such habitual confession; they would feel there was the danger of people lapsing into some sinful habit without it. No doubt there may be some in certain cases, but as it would tend to lower the authority of the conscience as it raised the authority of the priest, I think the ultimate result would be a less virile morality. When once people begin the habit of confession they begin to exaggerate formal ecclesiastical offences, they lose the idea of character and substitute the idea of discipline. What has been the aim

and ambition of the Church of England has been to build up character, and character is best built up by wise religious teaching, by everything that can be done to strengthen the conscience, and the influence of a sound, well-instructed public opinion.

Another direction in which rigid and old custom was broken down was that of fasting. So strongly was the importance of fasting pressed in the pre-Reformation period that to eat meat on a Friday was looked upon as heresy and might be punished by being burnt at the stake. It was no doubt the revolt against this extreme assertion of ecclesiastical offences that influenced much that was done at the Reformation; but here again the Church of England showed its moderation. It kept up days of fasting and clearly implied that fasting might be a godly discipline, but it left the regulation of it to the conscience of the individual. The Christian was to fast as our Lord had Himself directed, not with ostentation, not according to rule, but by imposing upon himself the discipline of life which seemed to him best.

We may illustrate this by what is, at present, an important question, namely, that of fasting Communion. The habit of fasting Communion has been reintroduced by the Church revival of the last century, and, to a certain extent, it has, perhaps, been made a party badge. It is insisted upon by some with great and, I think, excessive rigidity. I have read things which have suggested that fasting Communion is a fundamental religious principle which cannot be changed, and so much has it been pressed that people would rather not communicate at all than communicate without fasting. We ought to be quite clear that there is no doctrinal principle involved in fasting Communion; it is a rule of the Church. In the Church of Rome, where fasting Communion is normally insisted upon, it is recognized that it is simply a rule imposed by the Church on its members as part of what is considered a wholesome discipline. It is a rule which might be repealed at any time. During the war, for example, there was a definite dispensation to allow,

not only the reception, but the celebration of the Holy Communion without fasting. Fasting Communion is only a rule of the Church, even in churches where it is insisted upon. The Church of England, following its usual principles, does not insist upon fasting Communion; it leaves each communicant to form his own habit. It has never forbidden its members to celebrate without taking food. I must own that the habit that some adopt of having a meal quite late at night and then lying in bed in the morning until such time as they say Mass seems to me far less edifying than that of celebrating after breaking the fast in the morning. On the other hand, I think for those for whom the custom first arose, members of the Church of England of the upper classes, who live a comfortable life, the self-discipline of the early celebration is excellent. If, however, the parish services are arranged on the assumption that no one must receive except fasting great harm is done. A rule of the Church is made of greater importance than obedience to our Lord's commands. I respect those priests who, with considerable self-denial, keep their rules, but I do not think that any rules ought to be strong enough to prevent a priest from celebrating for a sick person at any time of the day or night. I think it is most unwise to impose upon oneself a rule so strict as to be injurious to the health, and the transformation of the Communion Service into a service where there are no communicants when it is celebrated in the middle of the day, largely to prevent non-fasting Communion, seems to me most unfortunate.

This leads to another question much debated at the present time, the question of reservation. There is, I think, no doubt either as to the teaching or the intention of the Church of England. The Church of England not only lays down a definite rule as to the way in which sick persons are to be communicated, but also commands the consumption of all that remains in the Communion Service. I do not doubt that any acquaintance with the writing of the time would make it quite clear that the object was to prevent reservation as inconsistent with the purposes

NORWICH PUBLIC LIBRARIES

and intention of the Sacrament. It is also true that this rule is being gradually broken down, and that both the House of Clergy and the House of Laity have recognized that some modification must be allowed.

I would speak, first of all, of reservation for the Communion of the Sick. The direction of the Church of England is, as I have said, quite clear, and I am sure that in all cases where it is possible the proper office of the Communion of the Sick should be used. It is entirely edifying and seemly. There are few who would not feel that the short service at the Communion of the Sick in the sick person's bedroom or some adjacent room, with two or three relatives or friends attending, is most solemn and impressive. There are, however, cases where a sick person may desire to receive the Communion and really be too ill for such a service, and when a parish priest tells me that there are thirty or forty sick persons that he has to communicate at Easter I feel that some relaxation of the custom is desirable. We know that at the time of Justin Martyr, in the middle of the second century, it was the custom for the deacons to take the Communion from the church directly to sick persons who were not attending. In the first two or three centuries of the Church there were a certain number of customs connected with the reservation of the Sacrament which seem to me superstitious, and, in fact, would be recognized by almost everyone as such, but on this point the precedent set by the use of the Church in Justin Martyr's time seems to be that which it is perhaps most edifying to follow. To take the Communion directly from the service in the church to a sick person unites him spiritually with the action of the Church and preserves the idea of Communion. I am quite ready to give leave for such reservation. I am further asked for permission for temporary reservation. It is pointed out that it is hardly possible to communicate sick persons in many cases directly after the service; I have been, therefore, asked to agree to temporary reservation and the provision in the church of a suitable place for this purpose.

To this I have consented in places where the need has been made plain. I am also of opinion that in the chapel of a hospital or where there is similar need perpetual reservation may legitimately be allowed, and if the same request were made to me in regard to any parish church I should consider the matter on its merits.

But now we pass to the second demand which is made, that of reservation for worship. I am afraid that I look upon the revival of the practice of reservation for this purpose as entirely contrary to the spirit of the Church of England, the purpose of our Lord in the institution of the Sacrament, and to healthy religious habits. I do not like to use such terms as "superstitious" or "idolatrous." I am sure in the case of some of those who practise the adoration of our Lord as present in the Sacrament there is no idolatrous intention in their minds. I am quite willing to allow that a great deal of the controversial language which is used is more violent than can be justified, but I am sure there is great danger in demanding an external symbol and sign in worship. There is a real danger that it may become idolatrous, not in intention but in practice. In any case it seems to me inconsistent with an intellectual type of religion. This applies even more strongly to the service of Benediction. That is a modern service even in the Church of Rome. It makes, no doubt, to some people an emotional appeal, but it is not only unauthorized in the Church of England but contrary to the more healthy traditions of the Christian Church. In granting, therefore, permission for the reservation of the Sacrament for the communion of the sick it must clearly be understood that I do not desire to allow any extra-liturgical adoration of our Lord as present in the Sacrament or any service such as Benediction, and I rely upon the loyalty of the clergy to support me in this matter.

There is, perhaps, one more question in relation to the services of the Church upon which I would just like to speak which may illustrate the temper and purpose of the Church of England, and that is music. In the

injunctions of Queen Elizabeth we find it provided that foundations and endowments for the encouragement of "the laudable science of music" should be preserved. Then it is further ordered that there be a "modest and distinct song so used in all parts of the common prayers in the church, that the same may be as plainly understanded as if it were read without singing; and yet nevertheless for the comforting of such as delight in music, it may be permitted, that in the beginning, or in the end of common prayers, either at morning or evening, there may be sung an hymn, or suchlike song to the praise of Almighty God, in the best sort of melody and music that may be conveniently devised, having respect that the sentence of the hymn may be understanded and received."

In the Church before the Reformation the development of much of the music had become over-elaborate. As in other matters connected with religious ceremonial, a body of clergy and experts whose life was mainly devoted to carrying on the services of the Church developed them more and more without regard to the habit of mind of the lay worshipper, and the music, like so much else, became out of touch with religious experience and very tedious. The Church of England did not wish to abolish music. From the beginning, as we know, there grew up in the Church of England a great school of Church music. What was aimed at was that the meaning of this service should not be overpowered by the musical element. There should be an element of simplicity about the music. Now, I cannot help thinking that in many churches where I go this point of view has been seriously neglected. The musician has got the upper hand, and he is often rather a bad musician. A great deal of our Church music is over-elaborate, does not appeal to the people and destroys rather than brings out the significance of the service. I am sure that what keeps many people out of church at the present time is too much unsuitable music. There are parish churches which attempt to have a service which would be suitable to a cathedral, and they

do not render it in a way which will appeal either to the musician or to the ordinary person. I am not going to give you any detailed directions in this matter. I am merely going to ask you always to keep before you the two principles of *simplicity* and *edification*. The music must be made suitable to the people and be something which they can understand and, for the most part, join in. While on special occasions, s on festivals, more elaborate music may be considered suitable and desirable, let it be remembered that because people like such a service occasionally, that does not mean they like it every day. Constantly repeated and elaborate musical services which may appeal strongly on occasion become simply tedious. I am sure that in many parish churches the music is overdone. I think in our villages it would even be better to read the Psalms, and in many churches I believe it would be best to make the congregation the choir; to have no special choir, but to have a congregational practice every week. I know parishes where this is done and where the service is simple and attractive, and the whole parish seems to like going to church.

I have, I think, considered sufficiently the detailed application of the principles of the Church of England. I have had two aims: the one is to illustrate the temper and tone of our Church; the other is to give directions on different points with regard to the services of the Church. Now I think that if you have followed me in what I have said it will become apparent to you that, whether we desire it or not, we do not, at the present time, regulate our services entirely by the letter of the Prayer Book. It is quite true that no one does so. Now I do not think in itself that that is necessarily a misfortune. No rule laid down three or four hundred years ago can possibly be applicable in its entirety at the present time. The circumstances of the Church of England have been such that legislative change has not been possible. Our services, then, are regulated by the Prayer Book as interpreted by custom and by the regulation of the Bishops. We clearly want our services enriched. I suppose there

are few churches where extra prayers and even extra services are not used. I am quite willing to take upon myself the responsibility of regulating services in the different churches as well as I am able, and of interpreting the directions of the Prayer Book and allowing modifications, and I think that if this action of the individual Bishops were controlled and regulated by the common action of the Bishops of the Province in Convocation we should be able quite well to deal with the present situation.

The other alternative is Prayer Book Revision, and of that I would say a little in conclusion. The proposal to revise the Prayer Book grew out of the report of the Commission on Ritual in the Church of England. The original intention when letters of business were granted to Convocation was to revise the Rubrics in order that it might become possible to enforce discipline. That gradually developed into the revision of the Prayer Book, and to that the Houses of Convocation devoted an enormous amount of care. Bishop Gibson was one, I think, who worked hard and laboriously as a member of the Committee of Convocation. I need not detail to you the various steps which have been followed, but ultimately with the creation of the Church Assembly the revision of the Prayer Book passed to a wider stage. So far it had been the work of a small body of divines and scholars; now it has come in touch with considerable popular movements, and the result of that has been the creation of a far more difficult problem. The number of pamphlets which have appeared—the Green Book, the Grey Book, the Yellow Book, and the White Books, show that if it be only in small bodies of persons there is a keen interest in the problems before us. There has been exhibited much liturgical knowledge and a considerable power of creation. The problem is a far larger one than it was.

Let us consider the purposes for which Prayer Book revision is desired. I will mention first one with which I have no sympathy at all. It is suggested that we should

have clear and definite regulations in order that the exercise of discipline may be possible. I am quite certain that if the authorities of the Church once begin to revive what they call discipline we shall have continuous trouble and dissension. But apart from this there seem to me good grounds for some revision. First of all, there is the fact that the letter of the Prayer Book differs on many points from the custom of the present day, and it is clear that it is desirable, as far as possible, that our Service Book should harmonize with our customs. Then, secondly, there is a certain amount, not very much but a certain amount, that does not harmonize with our habits of mind and custom, and seems to most people unedifying. That is the case with the somewhat frank language of the Marriage Service. Then, thirdly, the Prayer Book does not meet all our demands. Quite frankly, we want a greater variety of services and a greater variety of prayers. These three points of view would be recognized generally by all, but, as I have said, the question is a bigger one. There are all sorts of movements in the Church of England—Anglo-Catholic, Modernist, Evangelical—each representing different traditions, and the members of these parties are anxious that the Prayer Book should harmonize with their particular point of view. That creates a somewhat dangerous situation and suggests a development of alternate uses, a development which, I think, may very easily be detrimental to unity.

Then we have to remember that the greater part, I suppose, of the laity of the Church of England do not really desire any change. There may be this or that point which a certain number of people are prepared to criticize, but they are attached to the words of the Prayer Book. Religious temper always tends to conservatism; their minds are not subtle enough to be affected by the many elaborate questions which the people most anxious for reform are interested in; they are frightened that familiar words may be lost to them. Now I think that the conservatism of the great body of people is not a reason for

not revising the Prayer Book, but it is a reason for proceeding with consideration and caution. We must not do anything which may create a schism, and we must not do anything that hurts the feelings of the ordinary Churchman.

I am not going to discuss with you matters in detail to-day. There is only one matter of principle on which I should like to express an opinion, and that is the proposal that there should be alternative forms of the Canon of the Communion Service. Now within certain limits I think it is not only harmless, but even desirable, that we should allow variety. We have had for many years great variety in the hymns which we use, and on the whole we feel that that enriches our service. We may allow, too, very considerable liberty as regards the portion of the service after the Third Collect at Evening Prayer. Such liberty grew up instinctively during the war, and though many people feel rather happy sometimes when they come back to the old familiar words, yet the special prayers which came into use responded to a real religious demand. I am quite prepared within reasonable limits to allow at the present time the introduction of special prayers at that point in the service. Again, I have argued, and I am quite clear, that considerable variety in ceremonial and ritual might be legitimately demanded and allowed in the Communion Service. As a matter of fact, we have, at the present day, two uses as regards vestments, and, provided no clergyman acts against the desires of the great majority of his parish, I do not think that there is any real harm in that, and we may be quite clear that this variety will continue whether we recognize it in our revised Prayer Book or not.

On all those points, and on all similar points, I think we may recognize considerable variety, but as regards the Canon of the Communion Office there should, I think, be no variety. It is the central office of the Church and the most essential rite. I think that in all cases as regards the essential part of the Sacramental Service there should be one rule and form for the Church; there should be one

form in Baptism, there should be one form in Confirmation or Ordination.

Now as regards the present Canon of the Communion. It is, I think, quite adequate and sufficient, but it might quite well be enriched and enlarged; that need not, however, and ought not to be the work of any party in the Church of England. The form as we have it at present seems to me quite easily to lay itself open to being of the nature of a magic formula. It seems to me less evangelical than the canon of almost any other Church, and I am certainly surprised that there has been the opposition that there has to proposals which in their temper and tone seem to be evangelical, because they have been put forward by one particular party in the Church. Personally, I should like to see the Canon in the Communion Office enriched by an invocation of the Holy Spirit in some form, by a commemoration not only of the death and Passion of our Lord but of the other great events of His life, and by the solemn oblation of the Church as giving the intention of the sacrifice in the service.

I do not, however, think that any of these changes should be made until such time as they have been generally agreed upon and accepted. My own desire would be that the revision of the Communion Office should be referred to a small committee, consisting of about a dozen persons of trained liturgical knowledge coming from all the different schools of thought in the Church; that they should be asked to agree together on a revision of the Communion Office, and that when they had done that it should be put before the Assembly and accepted or rejected, and that we should have only one form of service. Such a committee would have to guide it the discussions which have taken place in the House of Clergy and the House of Laity, and I do not believe that the production of a reasonable agreement of reasonable men would be beyond the wit of men. No revision can be conceived in which any particular section of the Church would get all that it wants, but a revision can be conceived in which a reasonable variety would be allowed in

the matter of ceremonial and a canon constructed which would be found to be more catholic and more evangelical than our present Prayer Book, for I think our present canon is not very catholic and not very evangelical.

It would not have been possible within the time at my disposal to deal with the many questions that come before us in any completeness or fulness. I have tried to discuss them in a spirit of fairness, and following the principles of the Church of England in harmony with the teaching of Scripture and the old Fathers.

CHAPTER VI

THE ORGANIZATION OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

I PROPOSE to-day to speak to you of the Organization of the Church of England. That involves several interesting lines of investigation and raises questions which have vital importance, especially in relation to Christian Reunion. I shall discuss the authority and place of Episcopacy in the Christian Church; I shall examine the Anglican tradition of Episcopacy and consider in what points it is defective, and notice the significance of the changes that have been caused by the erection of the Church Assembly and the other local bodies dependent on it.

I

There is one preliminary question that I should like to discuss. It has been maintained by some writers—I may particularly mention Sohm, the author of a learned work on Canon law and the organization of the Church—that ideally all these questions ought to be outside our interest; that the existence of such things as rules, laws, penalties, hierarchy and Canon law are all fundamentally inconsistent with Christianity. They exist only owing to human imperfection. All Christians are priests, so there is no need of a priesthood. All Christians are brothers, so that there should be none to rule in the brotherhood. Our relations to one another are to be regulated by love, so there is no need of any code of rules. Our worship is the free worship of the spirit, so that there is no need of forms or ceremonies. Such an attitude is represented theoretically by the Quakers, although I believe as a matter of fact they do not find it possible to be quite consistent in practice.

Now this conception of the Church is, I believe, wholly

mistaken. It is, indeed, quite true that coercive legislation is always inconsistent with Christianity. "They that take the sword shall perish with the sword" is a maxim which gives the clue to much Church history. Whenever Christianity depends upon anything else than the free assent of the willing mind it is built on an insecure foundation. The Church which depends upon the State falls with the State.

But there is another quite different point of view from which we can look at it. When St. Paul makes use of the analogy of the body—"For as the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of that one body, being many, are one body: so also is Christ"—he is laying down a principle of the widest application, that true development lies in differentiation of function. The Christian society is not an unorganized collection of independent units; it is a corporate body in which each member has his special gifts and special functions. Its well-being, like the well-being of every living organism or every society of men, depends upon each member fulfilling the functions for which he is appointed and doing that in harmony with the well-being of the whole body. "God hath set some in the Church, first apostles, secondarily prophets, thirdly teachers, after that miracles, then gifts of healings, helps, government, diversities of tongues." In the ideal Christian society there will not be a plain level of uniformity, but each member of the Church will have his proper function to fulfil in relation to the whole, and its well-being will depend on the harmonious working of all these different offices.

And it is the same with relation to all external forms and ceremonies. The human spirit can only express itself through external action, and, as Dr. Robert Moberly says, that external action should be the best and the most suitable. The ideal would not be the complete absence of all external forms of expression, but the most perfect form. It is when the external organization or the form of worship cease to correspond with spiritual realities that harm is done.

"The bodily expression may, and will, be inadequate: there will always be a contrast—discernible at least, too often deplorable—between its meaning and itself: but even so, underneath whatever weight of failure, until it traitorously disowns its own significance, the imperfect outward will represent, will aspire towards, will actually in a measure express, that perfect ideal which is waiting still to gain, in outward expression, its consummation of reality."[1]

II

If we study the New Testament we do not find any clear indication of the form of the Christian ministry. The advocates of all the different systems which have prevailed have texts which they can quote that are most convincing to those already convinced, but singularly ineffective when applied to outsiders. I have already dealt with the texts which have been held to support the claims of the Papacy and need not pursue that argument any further, but all the other forms of polity are in just the same case.

There are certainly texts which can be used in support of episcopacy, but when we come to examine them we find the word *episcopos* is used as a designation of the *presbyter*. There is no clear indication of any form of monarchical episcopacy in apostolic times. It is certainly again quite clear that local churches were at one time governed by bodies of presbyters; but when we look at the relation that they bore to the life of the Church as a whole, with its apostles, prophets, evangelists and teachers, we fail to see any real resemblance to modern Presbyterian organization. So in the same way, although a study of the Church life of Corinth will show us that there were congregational elements, yet St. Paul's relation to the churches under him is not consistent with any complete form of congregational government.

In fact, we may put it quite clearly—the government of the Church and the development of the ministry during the apostolic age was different from anything that has existed since. The local communities governed by

[1] *Ministerial Priesthood.* By R. C. Moberly, D.D. London: John Murray, 1897. P. 35.

presbyter-bishops linked with one another by the spiritual life of apostles, evangelists and prophets, and the temporary authority of the Jerusalem Church with James the Lord's brother at its head have no real analogy in later times.

So with regard to the method of appointment. There seems to be adequate evidence that the method by which ministers of the Church were appointed was normally the laying on of hands with prayer, and I think that we may legitimately argue that following the example of the Apostles we should adopt that method, but we cannot go further than that. We have no express command. We do not know whether the custom was looked upon as necessary; for example, we cannot say certainly whether prophets were or were not ordained by laying on of hands, and we know that they might preside at the Eucharist. We do not know who might appoint by laying on of hands; there is no evidence that it was confined to the Apostles or their representatives, although it is reasonable to conjecture that such may have been the custom, for the Church was from the beginning a body where order and custom prevailed.

Now I think that this absence of explicit command and of certain custom is of great importance in giving us a right sense of proportion. I am going to argue shortly in favour of episcopacy and episcopal ordination as the right and proper custom for the Church; but it is one thing to say that a custom is right, another thing to say that it is essential for valid order and valid sacraments, and I do not think that there are any historical grounds which will justify us in saying that. At the present time there are large numbers of religious bodies, often for convenience called Protestant, who have no episcopal Church order, nor episcopal ordination, and what might seem to us great irregularity as to the celebration of sacraments. Even when they have an ordained ministry, they not only allow but encourage laymen to preside at the Lord's Supper, their reason being that they wish to protest against any sacerdotal theory.

On the other hand, these bodies are homes of devout Christian life. Their sacraments are for them very real. I remember talking once to a Nonconformist in my parish about the Sacrament, and was told how solemn was the service and how real its significance. You will find in Dr. A. J. Campbell's reminiscences a most impressive description of the Sacrament as it was administered in Ireland in his young days in the Presbyterian Church; and no one can doubt the religious significance of a Sacrament in the Highlands. We may quite rightly, from our point of view, speak of all these ministries and sacraments as irregular, but to call them invalid or destitute of spiritual reality we have no justification. Rather I would copy St. Augustine's language. When speaking of Donatist baptisms he quotes the text, "This is he who baptizes,"[1] and argues that in all cases the baptism is the Lord's baptism, and Christ is Himself the minister of baptism. So we may say by analogy, " This is He who ordains," " This is He who celebrates." It is the Lord's ministry, and the Lord's Supper, and Christ Himself it is who ordains and consecrates.

III

We cannot claim for episcopacy more than other forms of ministry that it was ordained by our Lord, or ordered by the Apostles, but that does not prevent there being strong arguments in support of it as the right and best form of order for the Christian Church.

In the first place, it has the argument of antiquity in its favour. Although there is no clear proof of it in the Bible, from the close of the apostolic period onwards, the government of the Church by bishops, priests and deacons appears (so far as our evidence goes) to be universal.

[1] John i. 33, *οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ βαπτίζων*. *Cf.* Augustine, *Cont. epist. Parmeniani*, II. x. 22, qua propter etsi aput christianos sunt aliqui praepositi vel ministri per iniquitatem et impietatem suam mortui, uiuit tamen ille de quo dictum est in euangelio: *hic est qui baptizat*, quia, sicut dicit apostolus, *Christus surgens a mortuis iam non moritur et mors ei ultra non dominabitur*. It is, of course, St. Augustine's theology and not his exegesis that I would cite.

The actual historical process by which this order was established in the Church is extraordinarily obscure, and nothing but conjecture on the subject is possible, but the fact that it was thus established is clear and undoubted. So universal did it become and so firmly established, that by the close of the second century the establishment of the bishops in the leading sees was definitely, and perhaps correctly, ascribed to apostolic action.

Then, secondly, it has the argument, if not of universality, of something approaching it. From apostolic times to the Reformation it is quite universal, and, so far as there was any opinion about it, looked on as essential and of divine origin. Since the Reformation, although for various reasons different Christian bodies have adopted other methods of Church government, it still remains the form of Church order of the great majority of Christians.

Thirdly, I believe it combines in the best possible way the two essential elements of strength and elasticity. As against outside forces of opposition, whether the State or any others, the isolated Christian community has little strength or coherence. On the other hand, the diocese, with its duly appointed ministry, independent of direct authority but bound to live in communion with the rest of Christendom, has freedom for experiment and initiative. There is, or should be, little or no coercive jurisdiction over it, but it is controlled by the common voice of the Christian Church. And whenever the attempt has been made to substitute jurisdiction in the place of influence, it has resulted in controversy, strife, and often schism.

This episcopacy, in its proper presentation, has never been a tyranny. It should always be constitutional and representative. Prelacy is not episcopacy. The Christian Church is the ultimate court of appeal and the presbyters are an essential element in the constitution of the society.

IV

Now let us turn to the teaching of the Church of England. I would ask you to notice the dignified moderation of its teaching. It accepts episcopacy, it insists on its ministers being episcopally ordained, and it clearly looks upon episcopacy as the right form of Church government, but it does not condemn the orders of any other body; it does not support its teaching by arguments which are unsound, nor does it teach any of those elaborations which have been added to the doctrine of the ministry. This is what it says in the preface to the Ordinal:

"It is evident unto all men diligently reading holy Scripture and ancient Authors, that from the Apostles' time there have been these Orders of Ministers in Christ's Church; Bishops, Priests, and Deacons. Which Offices were evermore had in such reverent Estimation, that no man might presume to execute any of them, except he were first called, tried, examined, and known to have such qualities as are requisite for the same; and also by publick Prayer, with Imposition of Hands, were approved and admitted thereunto by lawful Authority. And therefore, to the intent that these Orders may be continued and reverently used and esteemed, in the Church of England; no man shall be accounted or taken to be a lawful Bishop, Priest, or Deacon in the Church of England, or suffered to execute any of the said Functions, except he be called, tried, examined, and admitted thereunto, according to the Form hereafter following, or hath had formerly Episcopal Consecration, or Ordination."

At the time of the controversies which arose over the Kikuyu incident there was published by Dr. Mason a work on *The Church of England and Episcopacy*, giving a catena of the teaching of English divines on the subject from the Reformation.[1] This book will enable us to examine shortly the teaching of the Church of England on the subject. The first point that one notices is the importance the question of episcopacy

[1] *The Church of England and Episcopacy.* By A. J. Mason, D.D. Cambridge, University Press, 1914.

has acquired in the history of the Church of England—an importance which might almost seem excessive. Episcopacy has, of course, from the beginning been the most characteristic feature of the Anglican attitude, and although not the only question at issue in the various controversies, it has always been the most obvious and clear point. Nor can there be any doubt that the theologians of the Church of England have agreed in recognizing the importance, the benefit, and the desirability of episcopacy. Nor, again, can there be any doubt that it has been pre-eminently an episcopal Church. The Church of England has so presented itself to the world from the time that it became organized as a separate community. Nor do we hesitate to think that on the main historical questions involved and in the arguments which they have put forward in support of this form of polity our theologians have made a good case—most of us might think a decisive case. So far the agreement is general and remarkable.

It is, however, equally important to recognize the considerable diversities of opinion that this catena of authorities presents. There was an attempt made by many to prove that episcopacy was of direct divine institution; others claimed for it apostolic institution, and on this point there were clearly two different lines of tradition. Still more interesting were the discussions as to whether bishop and priest were one or two orders. It is a point upon which differences of opinion have always prevailed in the Church. Whilst the tendency of Eastern theologians has been to look upon the bishop as a distinct order, there has been a predominating tendency in the West to look upon the distinction of bishop and priest as one of office and not of order. On this point we find marked differences of opinion. Again, there were many different shades of teaching on the question how far episcopacy might be considered to be necessary for the Church or only necessary for its well-being. On none of these points can any clear or decisive decision be arrived at; on none of them is it at least necessary that a decision should be

formed, and on none does the Church of England in any of its formal statements speak at all plainly. Attempts have been made to add beliefs such as the divine institution or the absolute necessity of episcopacy to the necessary doctrines of the Church, but these have no authority either in general or Anglican teaching.

Still more important is it to notice the grave differences of opinion and the difficulties which have been raised as to the recognition of those not in episcopal orders. Whether from the point of view of policy or theory, there has been a marked divergence of teaching. On the whole the tendency has been to become more rigid. To take one or two instances: Bishop Andrewes was one of those who insisted strongly on the divine right of bishops, but he was not prepared to make episcopacy indispensable. Writing to Du Moulin as representative of the foreign Protestant Churches, he discusses the question whether those Churches could be said to have sinned against divine law. He had never said so. All that he had said was that there was absent from them something which was of divine law: it was not their fault but their misfortune. The evidence of facts proved that episcopacy was not absolutely indispensable. It does not follow that because episcopacy is of divine right, therefore a Church without it could not stand. As a matter of fact, he would be a blind man who could not see that there were Churches which were able to stand without it; he would be a hard man who would deny salvation to them. It was not possible for us to be so hard as to deny salvation to such Churches.[1]

Others, perhaps, took a more severe view, others a less severe view. Bramhall would not allow that the Church of England unchurched the Protestant Churches. "I cannot assent to his minor proposition, that either all or any considerable part of the episcopal divines in England do unchurch either all or the most part of the protestant churches. No man is hurt but by himself. They unchurch none at all, but leave them to stand or

[1] *Op. cit.*, p. 70.

fall to their own Master. They do not unchurch the Swedish, Danish, Bohemian Churches, and many other Churches in Polonia, Hungaria, and those parts of the world which have an ordinary uninterrupted succession of pastors, some by the names of bishops, others under the name of seniors unto this day. . . . They unchurch not the Lutheran churches in Germany, who both assert episcopacy in their confessions and have actual superintendents in their practice, and would have bishops, name and thing, if it were in their power."[1] When it came to the reconstruction at the time of the Reformation, Bramhall, like others, reordained Presbyterians who were willing, but did it inserting, certainly on one occasion, the following clause:

"Non annihilantes priores ordines (si quos habuit) nec invaliditatem eorum determinantes, multo minus omnes ordines sacros ecclesiarum forinsecarum condemnantes, quos proprio Judici relinquimus, sed solummodo supplentes quicquid prius defuit per canones ecclesiae Anglicanae requisitum, et providentes paci ecclesiae, ut schismatis tollatur occasio, et conscientiis fidelium satisfiat, nec ulli dubitent de ejus ordinatione, aut actus suos presbyteriales tanquam invalidos aversentur."[2]

More interesting, possibly, is Cosin, who deliberately communicated when he was on the Continent with the foreign Churches. He is not prepared to admit that they are right, but he says: "The act which they do, though it be disorderly done, and the ordinations which they make, though they make them unlawfully, shall not be altogether null and invalid."[3]

There are papers in Tillotson's hand giving suggestions of proposed concessions by way of a scheme of comprehension. As regards the foreign reformed Churches, he is prepared to agree "that for the future those who have been ordained in any of the foreign reformed churches be not required to be reordained here to render them

[1] *Op. cit.*, p. 215. [2] P. 218.
[3] P. 224.

capable of preferment in this church."[1] As regards those in England, "those who have been ordained only by presbyters shall not be compelled to renounce their former ordination. But because many have [doubted], and do still doubt, of the validity of such ordination where episcopal ordination may be had and is by law required, it shall be sufficient for such persons to receive ordination from a bishop in this or the like form: *If thou art not already ordained, I ordain thee.*"[2]

While, then, there are those on the one side who are prepared to admit in some way Presbyterian ordinations, on the other there were those who looked upon them as absolutely invalid. The point that we must make is that here also there was a double tradition in the Church of England.

So with regard to practice. When an attempt was made to apply episcopacy to Scotland in 1610, those who were consecrated bishops were not first ordained priests; but whether it was because their previous ordinations were accepted, or whether it was because consecration *per saltum* was looked upon as sufficient, is never clearly stated. On the other hand, when Archbishop Leighton, after the Restoration, was consecrated for Scotland, he was first ordained priest. In neither case was it considered necessary that any others in Scotland who had only Presbyterian ordination should be reordained.

V

At the time of the Tractarian revival the claims of episcopacy were reasserted in this country, as is well known, and the tradition in favour of it in the Church of England strongly insisted on. The two sides of the tradition were not dwelt upon. The most conspicuous feature of the Tractarian movement was the insistence laid on Apostolic Succession, an insistence quite out of proportion to what had been taught by other earlier Anglican divines, or, in fact, by the Christian Church

[1] P. 284. [2] *Ibid.*

NORWICH PUBLIC LIBRARIES

generally. As taught in recent years, the apostolic succession has meant that the grace conferred in ordination has been transmitted from apostolic times by laying on of hands; that if an ordination be valid, that is if it be performed in a correct manner by those in episcopal orders, and if the bishops themselves have been consecrated by properly consecrated bishops before them, they transmit the grace of orders, and that thus, to use a metaphor which is not uncommon, grace is transmitted from the Apostles to the present day, as it were in a golden channel. We find teaching something of this sort in Mason's work on the vindication of the Church of England at the beginning of the reign of James I.:

"Christ himself is the author of our orders, from whom the power of ordaining others, flowing as from a pure fountain first to the apostles, next, from the apostles, ran down to the bishops as its conduit-pipes; who at first being golden, and afterwards silver, at length, as the metal was debased and corrupted, became in some measure leaden. The orders, therefore, which at first were clear as crystal, became thick and muddy, and so came down to Cranmer."[1]

A much more intelligent account of the apostolic succession is that given by Beveridge: "The apostolical office hath been handed down from one to another ever since the apostles' days to our time, and so will be to the end of the world, Christ himself being continually present at such imposition of hands, thereby transferring the same spirit, which he had first breathed into his apostles, upon others successively after them, as really as he was present with the apostles themselves when he first breathed it into them."[2] This statement of Beveridge's is, of course, of a very different quality theologically to some of the others that have been made. He recognizes the true conception of ordination, but neither he nor anyone else has given any adequate reason for thinking that, however valuable particular ordinances may be for our own or for any other Church, the action of Christ in

[1] *Op. cit.*, p. 84. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 294.

fulfilling His promises should be limited by those ecclesiastical regulations. As a matter of fact, I do not think that the apostolic succession in the form in which it has so often been taught can be upheld.

In the first place, if we turn to the evidence of the early Church we shall find that although the apostolic succession was clearly taught from the second century onwards, yet in its original form it was not the later doctrine. As Mr. Turner clearly points out, there are two forms of apostolic succession. There is a succession by office and succession by ordination. To Irenæus, for example, succession is a succession by office. In the principal sees of the Church bishop had succeeded the bishop properly and openly appointed from the time of the Apostles, and that open succession was a guarantee of the sound tradition of Christian doctrine. At some later date the idea of succession by ordination grew up, but even then it was not normally accompanied by the idea of the transmission of grace from apostolic times. At what date this later conception came in I do not feel able at present to speak with any confidence. The evidence does not seem to me to be fully or adequately sifted or examined; even evidence from the fourth century is hard to find, if it exists.[1]

Then, secondly, this teaching does not harmonize with the better theological conceptions of the meaning of sacraments and orders which have prevailed in the Church. I have already touched upon this point, that the sacraments are not the work of the priest, that the real minister of the sacraments is Christ, that the priest is the minister of the Church in its priestly capacity, that the sacraments are given to us by Christ through His Holy Spirit in answer to the prayers of the Church. It might be quite legitimate to argue that the validity of sacraments depended upon the question whether they were performed in the Church or not. Again, it might be correct to

[1] *Essays on the Early History of the Church and the Ministry.* By various writers. Edited by H. B. Swete, D.D. Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1918.

argue that they depended upon the due fulfilment by the Church of Christ's commands, or even the due fulfilment by ministers of the Church of the Church order, but I do not think that it is really possible to argue that it depends upon what must be a mechanical theory of transmission of divine grace.

Then, thirdly, it is not really possible to believe that this theory is in accordance with facts. The spiritual reality and power of the Protestant Churches of the world, their theological learning, their missionary effort, are real facts, and therefore we may feel that the statements put forward by the Lambeth Conference do not go beyond what is real.

"It is not that we call in question for a moment the spiritual reality of the ministries of those Communions which do not possess the Episcopate. On the contrary, we thankfully acknowledge that these ministries have been manifestly blessed and owned by the Holy Spirit as effective means of grace."

May I express a hope, therefore, that we shall cease to lay stress upon what must be a mechanical idea of succession as being the guarantee of the validity of our orders and sacraments, that we shall recognize that orders and sacraments alike are conferred by Christ Himself, that they are conferred in answer to the prayers of the community offered up by its duly accredited ministers, and that, though it be the duty of the Church to guard its order and its sacraments by scrupulous care, it is not its duty to condemn those who have not had the same privilege or customs as our own particular section of the Church.

VI

But there are further directions in which new conceptions of the meaning and purpose of the episcopal office have come in. We are beginning to recognize now that in many ways the English bishop is mediæval rather than primitive. We have inherited many of the characteristics of the office as they developed in the Middle Ages. We know how gradually there grew up a separation between

clergy and laity, and how the clergy who had been associated intimately with the whole work of the Church had become a separated order and looked upon almost as mediators between God and man. So in the same way the bishop who had been closely associated with presbyters in the early period of the Church became more and more a governor who ruled the Church from without. Much indeed of the old ideals still remain, but that there is a difference no one can doubt. Now our more recent studies of the characteristics of Christianity in the first ages suggest to us a different conception of Church order. The bishop is representative and constitutional, the presbyterian and congregational elements both appear in the Church life of the time. Let us take these points in succession.

In the first place the bishop in the Primitive Church was elected by and was representative of the whole of the local Church. Whatever elements of outside authority or interference might come in, whatever witness there might be from outside, fundamentally the bishop was the man chosen by the people. Now I will not say that that does not apply to bishops at the present time. In some ways, perhaps, the peculiar method of appointment which prevails in England at present preserves that idea. The appointment by the Crown on the advice of the Prime Minister does lead on the one side to a careful method of selection, and on the other to the voice of different sections of the community being adequately represented, but it does obscure the fact that the bishop is the head of the local society and representative of that society. It is very doubtful whether it would be possible at the present time to obtain a better method of election. The methods prevailing in the Colonial Churches do not entirely commend themselves. It is, however, important to recognize that the bishop is not obviously a representative officer of the people.

Then, secondly, the rule of the bishop is constitutional. At the very beginning we find Ignatius dwelling on the harmony between the bishops and presbyters. The

bishop appears as the president of the Council of Presbyters. If we study the times of Cyprian we find that, however autocratic in practice he might be, yet, theoretically, he claims always to act in accordance with the advice of his Council of Presbyters and with the consent of the whole Church.

So, thirdly, the authority of the body of presbyters has to be recognized as an independent element in the life and order of the Church. The fact that, in the Western Church at any rate, ordination by the presbyters with the bishop has prevailed always is a visible sign of the original constitutional position of the presbyterate.

And, fourthly, the constitutional position of the congregation becomes clear. St. Paul, in the Epistle to the Corinthians, acts in close harmony with the congregation. In the earliest statement with regard to the appointment of the ministry, the much-debated passage in Clement, it has to be noticed that the consent of the Church is looked upon as essential for the office, and whenever Cyprian enumerates the conditions of a valid ordination it is the consent of the Church that he lays stress upon. The clergy are not the rulers of the Church but its ministers. The ultimate authority for doctrine is not the synods of the Church which formulate its decisions, but the acceptance of these decisions by the whole Church. Whether we look at the question of order or of sacraments we have to recognize the authority of the Christian community.

VII

In this survey I have attempted to balance all the varied elements which go to the building up of the Christian ministry, and I would conclude this section by quoting the resolutions with regard to the ministry which have been accepted by the Conference held at Lambeth.

1. A ministry of the Word and Sacrament is a Divine ordinance for the Church, and has been since the days of the Apostles an integral part of its organized life.

2. It is a ministry within the Church exercising representatively, in the Name and by the authority of the Lord Who is the Head of the Church, the powers and functions which are inherent in the Church.

3. It is a ministry of the Church, and not merely of any part thereof.

4. No man can take this ministry upon himself. It must be conferred by the Church, acting through those who have authority given to them in the Church to confer it. There must be not only an inward call of the Spirit, but also an outward and visible call and commission by the Church.

5. It is in accordance with Apostolic practice and the ancient custom of the Church that this commission should be given through Ordination, with prayer and the laying-on of hands by those who have authority given to them to ordain.

6. We believe that in Ordination, together with this commission to minister, Divine Grace is given through the Holy Spirit in response to prayer and faith for the fulfilment of the charge so committed.

7. Within the many Christian Communions into which in the course of history Christendom has been divided, various forms of ministry have grown up according to the circumstances of these several Communions and their belief as to the Mind of Christ and the guidance of the New Testament. These various ministries of Word and Sacrament have been, in God's providence, manifestly and abundantly used by the Holy Spirit in His work of "enlightening the world, converting sinners, and perfecting saints." But the differences which have arisen with regard to the authority and functions of these various forms of ministry have been and are the occasion of manifold doubts, questions, and misunderstandings. For the allaying of doubts and scruples in the future, and for the more perfect realization of the truth that the ministry is a ministry of the Church, and not merely of any part thereof, means should be provided for the United Church which we desire, whereby its ministry may be acknowledged by every part thereof as possessing the authority of the whole body.

8. In view of the fact that the Episcopate was from early times and for many centuries accepted, and by the greater part of Christendom is still accepted, as the means whereby this authority of the whole body is given, we agree that

it ought to be accepted as such for the United Church of the future.

9. Similarly, in view of the place which the Council of Presbyters and the Congregation of the faithful had in the constitution of the early Church, and the preservation of these elements of presbyteral and congregational order in large sections of Christendom, we agree that they should be maintained with a representative and constitutional Episcopate as permanent elements in the order and life of the United Church.

10. The acceptance of Episcopal Ordination for the future would not imply the acceptance of any particular theory as to its origin or character, or the disowning of past ministries of Word and Sacrament otherwise received which have, together with those received by Episcopal Ordination, been used and blessed by the Spirit of God.

I believe that the more those resolutions are considered the more fully it will be felt that they represent the different traditional elements in the Christian ministry, and that they will form in days to come an adequate basis upon which Christian reunion may take place.

There is one question, a question of serious difficulty at the present time, on which so far no solution has been attained. It is the same difficulty which has been felt in the English Church from the sixteenth century to the present day. What is to be the position of those at first who are not episcopally ordained? What is our own attitude towards the ministers of non-episcopal bodies? It is perhaps true that we are not yet ready to solve this question completely. I do not think that we shall solve it or get a proper perspective until we have learned to think more on the lines of the resolutions that I have put before you, and unless we are prepared to let our minds dwell more on the essential than the unessential elements in the life of the Church. I do not underrate the value or importance of questions of order. I believe firmly in the value of episcopacy and episcopal ordination for a Christian Church. I am convinced that no real reunion will take place except on some such basis, but I am equally certain that both in our thought and in our polity we have

laid far too much stress and importance on these things, and I think that the ultimate solution will come by closer mingling in work and thought, by laying greater stress on the ethical and spiritual and religious side of Christianity and by recognizing the subordination of questions of order to the greater issues involved in Christian teaching and life.

CHAPTER VII

THE CHURCH AND EDUCATION

THE subject upon which I propose to address you to-day is that of the Church and Education. It is a matter of the gravest importance at the present time both for the well-being of the Church and for the well-being of the State. I should like you first of all to consider (I do not think people quite realize it) how large a question that of education is at the present time. To look at the cost merely for one moment. The education estimates now are about fifty millions; to that you have to add what is provided by local authorities, and, in addition, the very large sums spent on education from educational endowments and from payments by private persons. The whole amounts to a very large sum. If you compare the cost of education with the amount spent on the work of the Church of England, you will be, I think, astonished at the difference. The total amount of the endowments of the Church of England comes to about seven millions, the voluntary offerings in church, including those for educational purposes, for missionary work, and many other activities, come to about nine millions. The whole of the work of the Church of England and all its activities do not cost more than sixteen millions a year. Without expressing any judgment on these figures, I think it is sufficient to impress you with the largeness of the educational work that is now being done.

Nor are the supporters of education in the slightest degree satisfied. There are continuous demands for more and more money. Those interested in education are demanding greatly increased grants; the teachers themselves demand larger and larger salaries. There is no cry more popular, in certain quarters at any rate, or which receives

greater assent in the newspapers at the present time than the demand for spending money on education.

The importance of the educational problem may be presented to us very clearly by what has happened and is happening in Russia. In old days, before the war, Russia represented a double aspect. On the one side, as regards popular education and the education of the masses, the control was in the hands of the Church, and the efforts of that body were directed to suppressing or preventing popular education, so that the great mass of the people were uneducated. On the other hand, in order to provide the intellectual class necessary for the government of the country and its scientific work, universities and technical schools were provided which were entirely secular, entirely apart from and even antagonistic to the religious interest of the country. These State universities and schools educated a large body of intellectuals, the *intelligentsia* of the country, who, almost by the force of circumstances, were placed in antagonism to organized religion; who, being able and educated men, were cut off from any control of the government of the country, and who became, therefore, a revolutionary element in Church and State alike. Russia before the war represented in an extravagant way two extremes of education—on the one side the suppression and religious control of all popular education, on the other side the over-development of a highly specialized secular education. Both elements alike contributed to the evils of the old society and its break-up.

Now if we turn to the state of Russia at the present time, we again have an instance given us of the power, as we should think evil power in this case, of education and the State control of education. The present Soviet Government, while carrying on its persecution of religion in the country, so far as it feels it safe, combines it with the use of the weapon of education by the State for destroying religion. On the one side the Church is forbidden, even voluntarily, to teach religion to anyone under the age

of eighteen; on the other side, Soviet schools have been established which are definitely directed to undermining both the religious and moral life of the growing generation. The children at these schools are encouraged in immoral habits from quite early years. They are encouraged to indulge in blasphemy against religion and to take part in blasphemous caricatures of religion in public. It is hoped in that way that the religious life of the Russian people will be gradually destroyed.

Now I think that anyone who ponders over those facts and the problems that they suggest will feel that the question of education, the right sort of education, the relation of the Church to education, and the relation of the State to education, are questions which demand a much more careful study than we have given to them. At the present time a great many people seem to think that you have only to say "education" and to vote money and all will be well. It has not occurred to them, or does not seem to occur to them, that it is much more important to decide what is the right sort of education, and that education, if it is of the wrong sort, may do no good but harm. We do not in this country have the same violent and crude methods that have always prevailed in Russia, but there are the same tendencies and the same influences working, and in some directions in a modified form similar results have shown themselves. With this amount of preface I will pass on first of all to some brief notes on the historical relation of the Church to education.

I

The origin of education in this country was entirely the work of the Christian Church. In the countries of Southern Europe there was an old tradition of education which the Church inherited. In the new countries of the North education was entirely built up by the Church, and the relation of the Church to education has always been a twofold one. On the one hand, it has worked, often very hard, in the education of the people; it has built up an educational system, and much of what is best in our

education comes from the original work of the Church. But, on the other hand, it has always made a claim to control education and to prohibit any education but that which itself gives. It will, I think, generally be found, therefore, that while in the early days of education the work of the Church has been of most benefit later, there comes a time when, owing to its controlling influence, and owing to its using its power to check educational developments, the value of what it had done has been diminished, and it may become in time, if its control remains, harmful. It must be remembered that if you once start education and your education is successful you will create in the human mind a desire for more learning and more knowledge. If you have stimulated the brain you have done something which ultimately you will not be able to control except in a harmful way. The human spirit will accept guidance, but when once stimulated it will not accept control. The educated mind wishes to break away from its leading-strings. If it is allowed to do so it will probably ultimately come home with a difference of spirit; if it is not allowed to do so it becomes revolutionary.

In our historical survey we have already spoken of the interest in learning which existed in the Church before the Conquest. I would like to be able to dwell longer on what is a fascinating and interesting theme. At Canterbury, at York, at Jarrow, at Winchester, at Malmesbury, in other places, there grew up schools of learning, and the foundations of our English society, whether Church or State, were laid upon a basis of learning. I need not refer again to the work of Alfred, except as illustrating the first appearance of the State in the organization of teaching and learning. We know how again and again the Danish invasions scattered and broke up the beginning of healthy learning, but we know how, in spite of that, English scholars were able to pass on to the Continent the torch of learning. Moreover, although we cannot estimate to what extent, there is some evidence of popular learning even at so early a date. If there were

few outside the circle of the clergy and the monasteries and some of the great men about the Court who were able to read or write, yet the opportunity of learning was open to a clever boy in any class of life. Only, if he had once begun to learn, there was no place for him to practise his studies except in the protection and seclusion of a monastery. On the other hand, if the great body of the people were illiterate they were not necessarily uneducated. The natural human ability, if it can come in contact with educated men, will acquire by speech and word of mouth and by its own capacity for thought a healthy culture of its own.

II

When we pass to the Middle Ages we approach a subject of great interest that in many ways is vitally connected with our life of the present time. It will only be possible for me to-day to touch on two or three points.

The first is the mediæval university. The universities of the Middle Ages rank with the great cathedrals and monasteries, and were among the most important institutions of the time. They represented in a remarkable degree vigorous intellectual life. They grew up as free associations of teachers and students under the auspices and influence of the Church. The great University of Paris was the model to which the others conformed, and both Oxford and Cambridge in their main features followed that model. Whether or no Oxford was founded, as the late Dean of Carlisle holds, by migration from Paris and Cambridge by migration from Oxford, in any case the continuity of life and system was undoubted. What I think impresses one most about them is the extraordinary intellectual freedom that they exhibited. There was no theological thesis, no philosophical problem that it was not legitimate to defend. It was only when, as in the case of Wycliffe, these theses were translated into life that the ecclesiastical authorities began to interfere. It was after the rise of Lollardism that interference with the liberty of the universities became apparent and

drastic, and this suppression of free thought helped to destroy the spiritual reality of the universities and prepared for the break-up of the Reformation. Had freedom prevailed the old studies would soon have begun to decay and the new studies would have been gradually assimilated.

The second point to notice is the activity of the Church in promoting education throughout the country. It was customary for schools to be attached to monasteries, to cathedrals, and to many of the chantries. The Lateran Council of 1215 enjoined that there should be a schoolmaster attached to every cathedral. It was no doubt systematizing what had already been done. At any rate there grew up a widespread system of education. When the English language took the place of Norman French, education spread more and education was open to all classes of society. Dr. Stubbs tells us: "A poor and humble origin was no bar to great preferment. . . . Everyone admitted even to minor orders must have been able to read and write . . . and the bishop who wittingly ordained an ignorant person was deemed guilty of deadly sin. The great obscurity which hangs over the early history of the universities makes it impossible to guess how large a portion of the clergy had received their education there, but towards the close of the period the foundation of colleges connected with particular counties and monasteries must have carried some elements of higher education into the remotest districts; the monastic and other schools placed some modicum of learning within reach of all. The rapid diffusion of Lollard tracts is itself a proof that many men could be found to read them; in every manor was found someone who could write and keep accounts in Latin; and it was rather the scarcity and cost of books, than the inability to read, that caused the prevalent ignorance of the later middle ages."

If we read Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales* we cannot doubt that such a poem could not have been read nor such events have been described unless there was a wide amount of diffused education and literary culture.

According to Mr. Leach, who devoted much investigation to the subject, there was a period preceding the Reformation when national education was in a far more flourishing state than it was at the opening of the nineteenth century. He calculates there were 300 grammar schools in England to a population of 2½ million people. This gives, he points out, one for every 8,300 people instead of one for every 23,000 as in 1865. In Herefordshire there were 17 grammar schools for a population of 30,000. It was with the fifteenth century that the hand of the Church became heavy upon the schools. The Wycliffite preachers had apparently founded many schools throughout the country and were spreading the Wycliffe doctrine, so we find the claim strongly made upon the part of the Church to control education. The Constitutions of Arundel, Archbishop of Canterbury, forbade " masters and all who teach boys " to teach theology contrary to the determinations of the Church. And it was added, " Because a new path oftener misleads men than an old, we will and ordain that no book or treatise composed by John Wicklif, or by any other in his time, or since, or hereafter to be composed, be henceforth read in the schools, halls, inns, or other places whatsoever within our province aforesaid, and that none be taught according to such [book] unless it have been first examined, and upon examination unanimously approved by the University of Oxford or Cambridge, or at least by twelve men chosen by the said universities."

There can be no doubt that this suppression checked the development of education and prepared the way for more serious changes.

A good deal of interest, national as well as local, is represented by the Gloucester School case which was argued in the Courts in the year 1410. There was in Gloucester at that time a Grammar School, and two masters of the Gloucester Grammar School brought an action of trespass against the master of another school. They alleged that the appointment to the Grammar School had immemorially belonged to the Prior of Llan-

thony, near Gloucester; that now the defendant had raised another school, so that whereas they were wont to take for each child forty pence a quarter or two shillings a quarter they now took only twelve pence. They claimed damages. The Courts refused to allow the case; they held that there may be loss without injury. Thus, if I have a mill and my neighbour raises another mill whereby the profit of my mill is diminished, I have no action against him although it is damage to me. The Judges held that the plaintiffs had no estate, only an uncertain ministry like any other person who, being as well qualified as the plaintiffs are, comes to teach youth. It is a virtuous and charitable thing to do, helpful to the people, for which he cannot be punished by our law.

The case is of grave importance, because it proves that the English common law held then that the teaching of the young being something beneficial to the people, there was fundamentally a free right in the exercise of it, and that, normally at any rate, no exclusive privilege could be given to anyone in regard to it.

III

We now come to the period of the Renaissance and the Reformation. Under the influence of the Renaissance there was considerable educational vigour in England, the effects of which were not wholly lost, but in its initiative at any rate the Reformation was unfavourable to educational development. It meant, for the most part, a set-back in education. The country was for more than 100 years distracted by religious controversy, and no freedom or religious toleration was recognized. The result was seen in the torpor of the eighteenth century. If the eighteenth century was a time of sleep, it was a time when many seeds were germinating, and from it came ultimately the intellectual and educational revival of the nineteenth century.

I would speak first of the influence of the Renaissance. I have already spoken of the band of English Humanists, of the closing years of the reign of Henry VII., and the

early years of Henry VIII., and of their influence upon the Reformation. It was to them that we owe the first reform of education. Linacre, Grocyn, Erasmus were among the first to teach Greek in this country, and the teaching of Greek spread to the public schools and grammar schools. Colet refounded St. Paul's School, and his work represents a landmark in education; and if we are able to trust Mr. Leach, the later years of Henry VII. and the earlier years of Henry VIII. were remarkable for the large number of new grammar schools which were founded. Henry VIII. was one of the most learned and best educated kings this country has ever had. He was keenly interested in education; throughout his reign many Acts were passed furthering it, and it was owing to his direct influence that reforms were made in the universities. An Act, in particular, was passed in the years 1535-36, exonerating universities and the colleges of Eton and Winchester from the payment of first-fruits and tenths in order that " the seven liberal sciences and the three tongues of Latin, Greek, and Hebrew be by his people applied and learned." The influence of this outburst of learning and teaching and of this interest in education, lay as well as clerical, showed itself in the intellectual vigour of the reign of Queen Elizabeth.

But the influence of the new learning was largely checked by the Reformation. There was a belief which prevailed at one time that most of the facilities for teaching in this country were due to the reign of Edward VI. and to the foundation of the Edwardian grammar schools. It is probably true that Edward VI. desired to strengthen the grammar school system, and that was possibly the object of the Act passed in the first year of his reign, whereby certain chantries, colleges, free chapels, and the possessions of the same be given to the King's Majesty. But whatever were the intentions, that was not the result. A certain number of the older grammar schools were refounded; there does not seem evidence that any new grammar schools were created, and large numbers of the older schools were suppressed and their endow-

ments diverted into private hands. The Commissioners appointed under that Act continued until the beginning of the nineteenth century, and made occasional efforts in the direction of giving money to education, but the Court of Chancery in its guardianship of the rights of property succeeded completely in stifling their efforts.

Meantime the inevitable result of religious controversy and of the policy adopted by the State of attempting to induce religious uniformity by State action inevitably led to the control of education by the dominant religious factor of the time. In Queen Mary's reign religious teaching was confined to the adherents of the old religion: in Queen Elizabeth's time the same authority passed to the reorganized Church of England, and the Church retained for itself complete control over education. It is of the greatest importance to recognize this fact, but it does not justify us in condemning what we now look upon as the imperfect ideal of the past. It was believed that a nation should be united in religious knowledge and worship, and undoubtedly the ideal is a right one. It was also believed that the best method of securing it was the authority of the State and the prevention of freedom. We look upon that ideal now as imperfect; we recognize the mistake that was made, but do not let us be too anxious to condemn. The Church believed that it was doing nothing but its duty in the action that it took, and Presbyterians or Nonconformists would have been equally determined to do the same thing. It was probably Milton who first made people recognize the advantages of freedom, that " all opinions, yea errors, known, read, and collated, are of main service and assistance toward the speedy attainment of what is truest."

It is necessary for our purpose now to say something of the control of the Church over education. In the Canons of 1603 it is stated that no man shall teach, either in public school or private house, but such as shall be allowed by the Bishop of the Diocese, and have subscribed to the recognition of the Royal Supremacy, to the Articles of Religion, and the acceptance of the Prayer Book. A

monopoly is granted to the curate of the parish church if he be suitably educated for teaching, unless there be a grammar school in the place. All schoolmasters are to teach in English and Latin, the long or short catechism, to take their children to church on Sundays and Holy Days to hear sermons, to train them up in godliness, and to teach the grammar set forth by King Henry VIII. But it was after the Restoration that this policy was put forward in its most extreme form. The Act of Uniformity of 1662 provided that every schoolmaster keeping any public or private school, and every person instructed or teaching in such schools, should subscribe a declaration that he would conform to the liturgy as by law established; while an Act of 1665 forbade dissenters to teach in any public or private school under a penalty of £40. I wish to dwell for one moment on these enactments. I shall have to criticize later some of the more recent actions of Nonconformists, but we have always to remember that they suffered much from the long period when education was prohibited to them, and when, as we shall see, they were cut off from the universities.

Let me turn for one moment to the universities. There was no one more eager and zealous in promoting learning than Archbishop Laud; there was no one within certain limits more tolerant and broad-minded than he was. His conception of Christianity was far more liberal than that of either his Nonconformist or his Roman Catholic opponents, but his desire for discipline, order, and uniformity, and his determination to impose his views in the fashion which ideas of the day justified made his action harmful. The Laudian Statutes gave order to the University of Oxford, but they restrained academic freedom, and they put the universities under the yoke of the Church. For some 200 years no degree was open to those who were not members of the Church of England, except during the period of the Commonwealth. I have always thought that this banishment of Nonconformists and Roman Catholics from the University has inflicted the gravest injury on our English religious and social

life, and has done more to foster religious disunion than almost anything else.

We have characterized the eighteenth century as a period of rest, but also a period when the germs of future work began. It is always a difficult epoch to understand, because any obvious generalization which we make is discounted. Undoubtedly it was the period when education was at its lowest ebb in this country, but it was also a period when more than 1,000 endowed elementary schools were founded and when the charity school began. It was the period, in fact, when elementary education first began to be seriously taken up. I cannot, however, but think that the way in which it was done has left a false ideal upon all education since then. The whole aim was to provide education for the poor. There were to be two classes: the well-to-do, who paid for their own education; the poor, who were paid for. No doubt it was inevitable, but it has led to State education in this country being looked at very largely as a form of charity instead of a national service.

IV

The nineteenth century might be defined as the era of education. More and greater changes have taken place in the last hundred years than at any period before, and I am not certain that in future generations the educational changes introduced in the nineteenth century may not be looked upon as the most important events of the century.

In most countries of Western Europe education has become compulsory, universal, and secular. Secondary and elementary education has been organized with elaborate care, and a whole army of writers have devoted themselves to studying the methods and the theory of education. Moreover, there has been a remarkable belief in what education is able to accomplish. If only, it was suggested, people were properly educated most of the troubles of society would cease, and though perhaps with some there is less confidence now and there has been a good deal of disillusionment, yet the cry for education

and the demands for State funds for education is still one of the most popular and most frequently made in our public press.

The characteristics of this new era have been first the establishment of State education. As we have seen, the great amount of education in the past has been directly or indirectly in the hands of the Church. Over the greater part of Europe education began through the influence of the Church, and it was largely through the Church that any sort of education grew up. Now there has been a great revolt from that. The object of the educational system has been to emancipate people from the hands of the Church. The modern system has been the result of the movement that has been called " Liberalism." From certain points of view the liberal movement in education was necessary and justifiable. We have seen how, when the teaching was in the hands of religious bodies, the system was frankly not liberal. The object of the schools was to teach people what was believed to be for their good, and, in accordance with the principles of government which almost universally prevailed, it was thought not only necessary to teach children what the religious society thought to be for their good, but to prevent any other sort of teaching. That, of course, was not fair. It was not in accordance with any principle of liberty, and when the conception of religious liberty grew up the desire for liberty in education was one entirely reasonable and proper. The interesting thing to notice is that the liberal movement, when triumphant, has become just as intolerant, just as bigoted, as the old clerical system had been.

To compel attendance at religious education and to allow no schools of any other religious body but that of the majority to exist is, of course, contrary to principles of liberty, but to prohibit religious teaching and to prohibit every other sort of school is equally contrary to the principles of liberty, and the fact that it has been done in the name of liberty makes it all the more discreditable to the human intelligence. One of the most

fundamental causes of the social unrest which prevails in modern society is the irreligious tendency of education, and I fear that the result will ultimately be that the idea of religious liberty will be lost. I notice with interest that the new Italian Government is now making religious education an essential part of the teaching of the schools. How far they are preserving religious freedom I do not know, but it is extremely probable that there will be a strong reaction against liberalism in education and in many other walks of life, and I think that liberals will have to pay the proper penalty for their failure. They had a magnificent opportunity if, coming in in triumph, they had then attempted to organize education on the basis of real religious liberty, giving freedom to different types of schools and different types of religious teaching. The idea of toleration and the idea of liberty might have been firmly rooted in modern civilization. But liberalism, by its gross unfairness to religion, has stirred up much resentment, and the swing of the pendulum may quite easily throw the control once more into the hands of the clericals, and I am afraid that they will show that they have learned the lesson which the practice and not the theories of liberalism have taught them.

Then, again, education has had a tendency to become national—sometimes in an extreme form. There can, I think, be little doubt that the over-developed nationalism of Germany was largely and deliberately fostered through the national education system. If we are to explain the rather crude internationalism which prevails in many circles at the present time, we shall find that really it is a reaction from this extreme nationalism. Whenever an unbalanced and one-sided teaching begins to be imposed, one may be quite certain that human nature will revolt against it. I see no reason for thinking that our human life can get on without the corporate action which nationalism implies. Patriotism and all that it implies are great elements in correcting the selfishness and individualism of the human race, but an over-developed nationalism means a national selfishness and,

like individual selfishness, will ultimately end in the injury of the nation which refuses to recognize the rights of others. No doubt, during the war some elements of German life were exaggerated to us, but I am sure that the way in which all departments of thought were subordinated to the creation of a great national egotism seriously injured the spiritual traditions of the German nation and have led to a development of disintegrating internationalism.

Another result of the influence of the State on education has been the development of bureaucratic methods. State money implies State control. State control builds up an army of officials. Officials like to do things in an official way, to have everything organized and symmetrical. It is reported of a French Minister of Education, not many years ago, that he said to someone who was interviewing him: "At this present moment every single school in France is teaching the same subject, and the teaching at all of them is regulated by the same syllabus and time-table." No doubt that story may be an exaggeration, and there have been many developments and improvements in the French system since then; but substantially it does present to us the great harm that is done by State control. Education is something intensely spiritual, and you cannot restrain the spiritual within the limits of a time-table. Education does not consist in learning a certain number of things in a certain number of hours, but in the influence of mind upon mind in the spark of fire which is struck when mind comes in contact with mind; and if your education becomes over-organized and formal you will destroy most of its value.

Then, again, the modern system has tended to become mainly secular. No doubt on the Continent this has been helped by the intransigent attitude of the Roman Catholic Church, which has generally refused to compromise. But there can be no doubt that always behind the promoters of modern educational methods there has been a definite anti-clerical or anti-religious tendency. We have seen how in the past the Church control of education

interfered with liberty and, we may add, turned men's attention too much to spiritual sides of life. The natural reaction has come: many of us may think that the reaction has been excessive and harmful. An over-developed intellectualism is a most disintegrating influence in life, and that has been the result of the modern developments of education.

Then, again, the inevitable result of the modern developments of education has been to make education democratic. In old days the ideal of education came entirely from above. It was either the influence of the Church or the influence of great scholars that gave the ideal, and the whole of educational development was directed towards securing the great scholar and the learned man, or the distinguished man of science, where science was taught, at the head. Naturally, that meant that many people were taught what had little value for them. They were never likely to be scholars; they had no interest in erudition. When they had learnt their Latin grammar they were not going to apply it, and so people began to feel that the old system of education was for many useless. Whether it was so may be doubted. The mental discipline of the training was far greater than is realized at the present time, and at any rate the boy who was not successful went away from school realizing that there were whole realms of thought he could not approach. The modern method tends to organize education in the interests of the many and not of the few, and the result is a shallow and most imperfect system. The tendency is to make education easier, to teach only what may be looked upon as practically useful, and therefore neither to discipline the mind nor create any ideal. Modern education has a great tendency to produce an ignorant self-satisfaction. The standard of taste, of knowledge, of attainment, is lowered rather than elevated, and the result of a wide diffusion of education has been to make real education for the abler men more difficult than it was. The modern school seems to have lost the ideal of the scholar.

V

All these principles have prevailed throughout Western Europe to a greater or lesser extent. In England, as so often happens, there has not been the same tendency to extremes. The traditions and the independence of our universities, the power and influence of our public schools which have been able to preserve their independence, the strong hold which the Church has had upon our educational system, have prevented and checked modern developments; but all the same great changes have taken place, and are taking place, and may very likely become more rapid in the immediate future, and I want now to speak more particularly about our own problems.

I should like to begin by saying that I think it will be found that a great mistake has been made in our modern educational system because we have organized it from below upwards. The reason of that has been that it was thought the upper classes could find their own education, and they had the help of almost all the educational endowments in the country. What was necessary was to continue and extend the work of the charity schools of the eighteenth century. So education has come to be looked upon as something primarily in the interests of the poor and not as a great national service. I do not think we shall get our educational system put right until we have a Minister of Education who looks at things from the other point of view, who begins his survey with the universities, who puts all our universities on a sound basis, and who then organizes other aspects of education in relation to them.

Then, next, we are suffering more and more in this country from the development of a bureaucratic method of organization. It is showing itself at the present time in the cry for the unification of education. What we want, say our reformers, is one uniform system of national education. It is this which is threatening our Church schools so much at the present time, and, strangely enough, we are being exhorted on all sides that it is our duty to give

way to this cry. Looking at the matter purely from an educational point of view, I think that the whole movement is thoroughly evil. Anyone who has had dealings with the Board of Education and the Local Authorities in recent years is conscious of the constant and continuous efforts being made by the Central Authorities to get control over the whole of our educational system. When I was at King's College the Board of Education managed to oust the Treasury and get the newer universities and university colleges into their hands. In recent years they have got their hands into the universities of Oxford and Cambridge; they are making continual efforts to get hold of public schools, and many Local Authorities resent the independent status of Church schools. Church schools are handicapped by the need of collecting subscriptions for the upkeep of their buildings. They have to pay their share of the cost of buildings or improvements in Council schools, and also to provide money for their own. Then the idea is started of grading schools, or of joining those of two small villages, or of making one into a boys' school and another into a girls' school. So it is suggested that for administrative purposes there should be one unified national system. Local autonomy and religious freedom would be further diminished, and centralized control would be more perfect. All this results from the control of education being in the hands of local bodies and of officials with whom the unimportant things are looked upon as the most important. Buildings, uniformity of system, carefully kept statistics, are all of very secondary importance compared with intellectual and spiritual aims.

From the administrative standpoint no doubt an office likes to have all its schools uniform, likes to treat them as part of a great business, to move its teachers about in a way that is convenient to it, to be able to administer all schools in the same way, to see that the time-table and instruction are of a similar character, and to keep out local interference. It is always the way of officials, and it is always a bad way.

Now I do not think that we can really hope for any

improvement in our educational system, or that the country will get the full value for the money that it spends on education, unless quite different methods are adopted. We want to realize that modern bureaucratic methods, modern business methods, and centralized control are quite incompatible with everything that is really sound in education. Just as religion managed and controlled by the State at once becomes dead and unreal, so education managed and controlled by the State tends more and more to become unreal.

And then, again, rising out of this and connected with it, is the fact that if your education is to be of value it must be definitely spiritual and therefore in close association with the religious life of the country. We have seen in the past the evils of Church control over education; we are seeing now the evils of anti-clerical education. We want to have the full influence and power of religious reality in education, we want to have a system which gives complete freedom.

Now in the Middle Ages there were three great departments of life. They were described as *Imperium, Ecclesia, Studium*. There was the Empire and all that it stood for in the way of the political government of the country, centred as far as the Continent went in the Holy Roman Empire and representing the due organization of every grade of society from the political and social point of view. Then there was the Church, with its centre at the Vatican, dealing with the spiritual life of men. And then there were the universities, with the University of Paris at their head, dealing with man's intellectual nature. What I want to put to you is this, that if education is to be free and spiritual it must be organized on its own basis, independent of Church and State, uncontrolled by either, but working in the closest harmony with both.

Let us apply these ideals to the actual problems of the day. First of all there must be our universities, and it should be the business of the Government to secure that these universities should be free and self-governing communities. The power of the Crown should be limited

to the visitatorial power of inspection and of altering statutes when occasion arises. The founder of a college in old days gave the college a body of statutes and left it to live its own life: he made it a self-governing corporation. That must be our ideal. And as regards religion it must be free. We have seen the mistake of the Laudian Statutes at Oxford, which excluded Nonconformists. Equally harmful and more unintelligent are the Statutes of Leeds or Liverpool, which exclude a theological faculty. If the universities are left free they will organize their theological faculty in a free way, and religion will be brought in the closest contact with the life of the university without in any way interfering with its freedom. There has been in some of the universities in recent years sufficient freedom to enable them to do that. To impose an undenominational faculty of theology on a university is just as inconsistent with religious freedom as to impose a denominational faculty; but the faculty which unites together the teachers of the different religious bodies for the purpose of university organization gives quite sufficient university control and quite real independence. The college is associated with the religious body, the faculty is free. Interdenominationalism takes the place of undenominationalism.

Nor if the principles of freedom were recognized need there be any difficulty about secondary education. Every secondary school should be looked upon and created as a free and independent unit, and if support has to be given from State funds it should be given to all schools equally. The present regulations are based upon the principle that if Government help on any substantial scale is given, or if local help on a substantial scale is given, the school must be in the hands of the local authority, and every sort of restriction must be put upon religious teaching, and the result is that municipally organized schools fail to carry out the ideal of a school life. A modern secular school is put forward in the name of liberty; it is really the antithesis of liberty. It does not even represent the desires of the majority. Even if it

did, there is just as much intolerance in a majority imposing itself on a minority as there is in a Church imposing itself on Dissenters. Every secondary school should be left free to organize religious instruction in its own way, care only being taken that where there is one secondary school in a given area the children of the minority should be protected by a conscience clause, and where the minority was sufficiently large that they should have the right of their own religious teaching. If adequate freedom were left to a properly chosen body of governors who were independent of municipal or political elections, gradually a system of religious instruction would be built up which harmonized with the wishes and the desires of the people of the place.

When we turn to our system of elementary education, the unfairness of it is obvious. The majority of the people of this country desire religious education, a very large number denominational education. If once it is recognized that the rights of those who demand religion, and of those who demand denominational religion, ought to be respected just as much as those who do not want religion, it will become possible to have a sound system of education. In the vast majority of parishes in this diocese a great majority of the people belong to the Church of England. It is obvious that in these parishes there should be a Church of England school. Every child should be protected by a conscience clause. Wherever there are sufficient numbers of those who are dissatisfied with the religious teaching of the majority, they should be allowed full facilities for having religious instruction of their own either inside the school or outside it, as is most convenient, and this should be paid for in exactly the same way as the other religious teaching.

I have in my mind two parishes not in this diocese. In one there is a small Roman Catholic minority; they have full facilities given them for instruction by their own priest outside the school during the hour given up to religious instruction. The other is in a place where the majority of the people are Roman Catholic; it is a Roman

Catholic school; but the vicar of the parish has full facilities for teaching the Church of England children in the school during the religious hour. But in most parishes, even where there is a Nonconformist minority, that will not really be necessary, for the school should be a Village school, and the teaching will not be of a character which the Nonconformists will object to.

When I had a somewhat large country parish we had nothing but Church schools. I was most anxious that the Nonconformists should be treated with the greatest courtesy and consideration, and I went round to every Nonconformist family and asked them if they had any objection to make to the religious teaching that was based upon the Church catechism, and they were all quite convinced that they had no complaint to make at all. In only one case was there any difficulty, and that was in the case of the family of a very strict Baptist. They were not allowed to learn the Church catechism, but we made no difficulty about it, they were freed from the teaching of the catechism when that went on. Minorities of single families cannot expect to have their spiritual teaching provided for them, but they can expect to be treated with toleration and courtesy.

What I want to suggest is that we should aim more and more in making the elementary school not the Council school, not the State school, not the Church school, but the Village school. Until you do that, until you put the authority and interest of the people into the school, you will not get the full value of the money that you spend at the present time; you will have a revolt against the school in the minds of many people; you will not have that if the people themselves have more of a voice. It should not be the parson's school, but the parson and the Nonconformist minister (if there is one) would naturally be the two people who would be most interested in the school.

As regards towns there would be little difficulty, for there it is possible to have different types of schools with different religious teaching. More and more the

NORWICH PUBLIC LIBRARIES

development must be towards making the town school, like the country school, or the secondary school, or the public school, a free corporation, able to organize its own religious teaching. The Church of England and the Roman Catholic schools will take their place in this body, but there should be no financial penalty attached to them because of their religion. It would only be when there is a monopoly that any interference with liberty can take place.

There are, of course, many aspects of the educational problem which I have not been able to discuss to-day, but, looking at the state of education in this country, I am convinced that there are two movements, both dangerous to freedom, which have to be strongly resisted at the present time. The one, the attempt to make our education more bureaucratic, to get the schools more and more into the hands of the local authority or the central authority, to take away the initiative and freedom of the teachers and of the local governors. The other is the attempt to introduce anything like a uniform or systematized system of religious teaching. The remedy lies in recognizing that State control of education is just as great an evil as Church control, and that unspiritual education is more harmful than the intolerance of the old system. We want to secure, therefore, that the guiding principle of our education should be given not by Government offices, but by a body of free universities. They will set up the standard, and to that standard the secondary schools will have to conform. These secondary schools will themselves be a number of free corporations, some teaching in one way, some in another, free to organize their religious teaching in accordance with their charter in some cases, without even that restriction in others, only, in the case of schools serving a particular district, having strict protection of minorities. So our elementary schools will have their standard fixed by the secondary schools to which their more promising pupils will go, and

these schools, again, will be free bodies as regards religion. There will always be a strong protection of minorities wherever it is necessary, but the schools will be able to organize their religious teaching quite freely in accordance with their trust deed, or, if there be no trust deed, as regards education in accordance with the desires of the parents. No school will be penalized because it teaches religion.

I have purposely avoided attempting to be too systematic in my suggestions; at the present moment it is not system that we want, but it is a correction of our ideals. What we have to realize is first that the State control of education is as evil as the Church control; secondly, that religious liberty consists not in freedom from religion but in freedom to be religious; thirdly, that education is something spiritual, and that bureaucratic, or centralized, or office control is always injurious to it; fourthly, that the people of this country will not care for education until those who use the schools are personally interested in the management of them.[1]

[1] In the historical part of this article I have been assisted mainly by two books: *State Intervention in English Education*, by J. E. G. de Montmorency (Cambridge: at the University Press, 1902); and *The Schools of Mediæval England*, by A. P. Leach (Methuen and Co.).

CHAPTER VIII

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND AND ITS RELATION TO OTHER RELIGIOUS BODIES

I PROPOSE to-day to address you on the subject of the relation of the Church of England to other religious bodies. In doing that, I do not want to confine our outlook to any one direction. We are dealing with the divisions of Christendom. Just as, when we considered the nature of the Church, we tried to work out a theory which would apply to all the different sides of Christian life, so in regard to our practical outlook we must not limit ourselves by looking to one side only. There are some who keep their eyes fixed on Protestant Churches, others on what they call Catholic Churches. Either point of view will give us an imperfect conception. We must be prepared to balance our judgment by looking all round.[1]

Now with regard to these divisions of Christendom, I want to try and estimate the cause of them. I do not mean the causes through which they have actually arisen. These have been varied. Sometimes divisions have arisen, we might hold, from good causes, sometimes from evil causes. In most cases there has been a mixture of good and evil. They have come from want of charity, from evangelical earnestness, from a desire of truth, from a desire of supremacy. It is not with these causes that I am concerned now. I want to estimate the intellectual cause which lies behind them, and I think that we may put it as this—a mistaken view of religious truth, an idea that religious truth must necessarily be some-

[1] In this chapter I have introduced quotations with considerable fulness with the purpose of presenting the point of view of different schools of thought.

thing capable of exact definition, which can be quite accurately expressed, and that it is the duty of a Church to define in this or that direction its beliefs, and exclude from its fellowship those who are not prepared to accept the same point of view. It is the same with regard to ecclesiastical relations. It is held that the notes of the Christian Church can be quite definitely and decisively laid down, that we can say clearly and distinctly what is part of the Church and what is not, and therefore we must exclude from our fellowship all who do not fulfil these exact conditions. These two standpoints, the rigid definition of doctrinal truth and the rigid definition of the sphere of the Church, have been held in many directions. They represent, of course, the point of view of the Church of Rome and of the Eastern Church. They have been held tenaciously by some members of the Church of England; and many small Protestant sects have held the same view, and have felt called upon to separate themselves from anyone who did not conform to their conditions.

The changed point of view that has come or is coming recognizes that we cannot deal with religious truth or ecclesiastical conditions in this way; that our human language is too imperfect for it to express religious truth in the exact manner which is desired; that different aspects of Christianity appeal to different minds in different ways; that the different forms of Christian life which have arisen do not represent the one a right and the other a wrong view, but they both represent indifferent and imperfect views, and that therefore, whether in our judgment on the divisions of Christendom or in our desire for reunion, we must give up this rigidity of thought. Let me quote in support of this some remarks of Dr. Carnegie Simpson in his book on *Church Principles*.

"A first rule in all sound and scientific thinking is that we must never force our conclusions to be more precise than our *data* warrant. Theological thinking greatly needs to learn this rule, not merely in connection with the topic of the Church but in connection with many of

its topics. A real fault in much of our theology is that it has not known where to stop; but 'the power of halting at the right point is one of the rarest powers even of clear-sighted and truthful minds.' We must remember this in connection with the question before us. We should and must accept the fact that, while we have plain ground and reason to say that the Church on earth must be a visible body, and have adequate material in history to say that it has been and is visible, we simply have not the *data* which enable us to draw its outline with perfect precision and so locate it with absolute accuracy. We may wish we had. . . . But in all matters of fact, the question is not what we should like to have, but what we do have, or, to put it religiously, what God has been pleased to give us. And on this question God has not given us exact lines. That it is so is nothing exceptional. On many of the most vital matters of religion we have, while adequate, not absolutely exact *data*. Take the Bible. There is a real and reliable record of revelation; but there are places where the text is not authentic, and, possibly, even whole books may be of disputable canonical authority. Take the even more vital example of the earthly life of Christ. It has historical reality which is proof against all negative criticism . . . but there are details in the story which it is impossible for any candid-minded student to deny are open to critical uncertainty. If, then, we are not given exact lines about the Bible, it is not wonderful that we do not have them regarding the Church. . . . This way of reasoning is unacceptable to the Biblical literalist and to the ecclesiastical legalist. But the foolishness of God is always better than the wisdom of literalists and even of lawyers. We have not got the exact *data* they demand. Yet all the time, there is an authentic revelation to read, a real Christ to know, and a true Church to see."[1]

It is this changed standpoint which has influenced the Lambeth Conference and has led to the setting forth of a new principle with regard to reunion, and there can be no doubt that this new standpoint has penetrated, or is penetrating, religious bodies in all directions in a way

[1] *Church Principles.* By P. Carnegie Simpson, D.D., Professor of Church History in Westminster College, Cambridge. Hodder and Stoughton, London. Pp. 41-43.

which would not have been possible a little time ago. This is what the Lambeth Conference says to us:

" The times call us to a new outlook and new measures. The Faith cannot be adequately apprehended and the battle of the Kingdom cannot be worthily fought while the body is divided, and is thus unable to grow up into the fulness of the life of Christ. The time has come, we believe, for all the separated groups of Christians to agree in forgetting the things which are behind and reaching out towards the goal of a reunited Catholic Church. The removal of the barriers which have arisen between them will only be brought about by a new comradeship of those whose faces are definitely set this way.

" The vision which rises before us is that of a Church, genuinely Catholic, loyal to all Truth, and gathering into its fellowship all ' who profess and call themselves Christians,' within whose visible unity all the treasures of faith and order, bequeathed as a heritage by the past to the present, shall be possessed in common, and made serviceable to the whole body of Christ. Within this unity Christian communions now separated from one another would retain much that has long been distinctive in their methods of worship and service. It is through a rich diversity of life and devotion that the unity of the whole fellowship will be fulfilled.

" This means an adventure of goodwill and still more of faith, for nothing less is required than a new discovery of the creative resources of God. To this adventure we are convinced that God is now calling all the members of His Church."

This must, then, be the standpoint from which we are to contemplate all the different religious bodies, and I will group them under four headings. There is, first of all, the Church of Rome; secondly, Protestant Churches at home; thirdly, Continental Protestantism; and fourthly, the Eastern Church. I would say something about each, and in relation to each there have been happenings in quite recent times which will form the text of what we have to say.

I

We begin with the Church of Rome, and we naturally turn to the Malines conversations. I have spoken about these already, and I need only shortly repeat what I have said. We are not really concerned with the curious controversy that has arisen as to which religious community has been wicked enough to try and behave in a Christian way for the first time. I have seen letters from Roman Catholics in *The Times* saying that it is inconceivable that Rome should do anything so outrageous as to stretch out the hand of courtesy to other Christians. I have seen a letter from a distinguished Modernist to say that if it is quite clear that the Archbishop of Canterbury was not wicked enough to begin things it is all right. Is not there something contemptible about this ? Surely, when there is a great body of Christians with many of whom this country was closely associated during the strain of the Great War, what we should pride ourselves upon is being the first to take up these negotiations. It is the narrowness of Romanism, the narrowness of Anglicanism, and the narrowness of Protestantism which is wicked, and not the desire for friendly and Christian relations. I believe that really the originator of the whole has been Lord Halifax, and though I do not always agree with him, and though I shall shortly have to criticize some of his writings, I think that the piety and the courage and the imagination that he shows is a fitting crown to a life devoted to the cause of religion in an almost unique way.

If Lord Halifax has the first credit, the second credit must be due to Cardinal Mercier, who has had the courage to write and to act in a way which has brought down upon him the attacks of some of those extremely unworthy members of the Roman community, the English Roman Catholic controversialists; and, in the third place, the credit is due to the Archbishop of Canterbury, who has had the courage not only to give his personal support but to say openly that he has done so.

But now we must pass to the more difficult problems of the questions before us, and obviously and clearly the one fundamental question is the Papacy. I think it will be as well to start with the pamphlet of Lord Halifax—*A Call to Reunion*[1]—and with the views that he puts forward as regards the Papacy. I will give one or two extracts:

"Perhaps also a not dissimilar consideration might assist agreement about such points as the Papal Supremacy, and the Decrees of the Vatican Council. It is well to remember, with a view to reunion, two pronouncements of Leo XIII. when speaking of the independence of civil society, (1) that the supremacy of the Pope implies no claim to authority in temporal and civil affairs, and (2) that the authority of every bishop is 'jure divino.' In regard to the Vatican Decrees, a great difficulty is removed if it is admitted that no power is claimed by the Council for the Pope apart from the Church, and that what it claims for the Pope is simply the power, after having taken every means to ascertain what the teaching of the Church is on any given point, to declare that teaching in an authoritative manner. In short, the power of the Pope is not the power to declare or impose a new dogma, but only to declare, explicitly and authoritatively, what is the faith committed by our Lord Jesus Christ to the Church's guardianship."[2]

He later tells us that this was accepted as an exposition of Catholic teaching.

"The statement in the memorandum as to what was claimed for the Pope by the Vatican Decree was accepted as an exposition of Catholic teaching, that the privilege of Infallibility does not separate the Pope from the Church, that the Pope cannot act apart from the Church of which he is the head, that his power is by no means the power of declaring or imposing a new dogma, but only the power of declaring explicitly and authoritatively what is the faith committed by our Lord Jesus Christ to the

[1] *A Call to Reunion.* By Viscount Halifax. Arising out of discussions with Cardinal Mercier (Archbishop of Malines). Mowbray and Co., Oxford.

[2] *Op. cit.*, pp. 4, 5.

keeping of His Church. That a dogma is not the expression of a new truth, but the authentic formulation of a truth which from the beginning was contained in the deposit of revealed doctrine. It is the bringing to light of what there was in germ form already contained in the word revealed by Christ to the Apostles."[1]

Lord Halifax then goes on to discuss the Roman position in relation to the Anglican and Orthodox Churches.

"What," he argues, "is the claim of the Roman Church and of the Papacy as to its own prerogative, over and above the power of binding and loosing equally conferred by our Lord upon all the Apostles and their successors? It is best to state the matter quite plainly and without any ambiguity. . . .

"He conferred on St. Peter something over and above what was conveyed by Him, on two separate occasions, to all the Apostles. That something was the power of representing the Church as its visible head, with the general duty of watching over the observance of such Canons as concerned the Church as a whole."[2]

He then sums up the claim put forward by Cardinal Mercier, and proceeds:

"From any point of view those who desire the reunion of Christendom ought to weigh his words. He expresses the Roman claim and the Roman view, and the question of reunion, if it is to be approached with any hope of success, must depend upon how far a way can be found to reconcile that claim with those of the Orthodox and Anglican Churches. And the question I would ask those who have the interests of the Church of England at heart is whether, in view of those interests, and those of the whole of Christendom, they are not bound to work and pray for the speedy reconciliation of these conflicting claims?

"The Collect for St. Peter's Day, in the Book of Common Prayer, recites that Almighty God by His Son Jesus Christ gave to His Apostle St. Peter many excellent gifts, and commanded him earnestly to feed His flock. May it not be that among those excellent gifts was included

[1] *A Call to Reunion.* By Viscount Halifax. P. 10.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 13.

that primacy which was to guard and preserve the unity of the members of the episcopate, and that of their separated flocks scattered throughout the world ?"[1]

He points out what to him seems the need of some centre for the Christian Church. He draws attention to the dangers of faith and morals, the evils of schism, the encroachments of the State on spiritual matters. We want a Spiritual Head, he argues, at the present time.

" Is it possible to exaggerate the strength that would be given to the Christian cause in Europe, or indeed throughout the world, were England and Rome again at one ? Can we doubt the need there is for the union of all men of goodwill at the present time if the difficulties which beset the Christian religion are to be met at all adequately ?"[2]

He speaks again of the sanctity of morals, and he suggests as a conclusion that on one side there shall be the recognition of a visible centre of the Church, and on the other side the full powers and authority of the episcopate should be equally recognized.

" The recognition of a visible centre of the Church, if reunion is to be achieved, is necessary, but it is no less necessary that the full powers and authority of the episcopate should be equally recognized, not only in theory but in practice, and that due scope should be given to national habits and temperament in the exercise of the Catholic religion. In no other way can we hope for reunion, or to see the extension of the Catholic religion throughout the world."[3]

I think that I have fairly put forward Lord Halifax's plea. Let us try, therefore, to examine his contentions. In doing so I think that we shall find that there is a good deal of confusion of thought. At one moment he is suggesting that we should agree to what we would all accept, but he slurs over the fact that from the Roman point of

[1] *A Call to Reunion.* By Viscount Halifax. P. 15.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 18. [3] *Ibid.*, pp. 20, 21.

view it would be found to imply a good deal more than he suggests.

Let us begin by analyzing what the position of the Pope at the present day implies. First of all, it implies a primacy among bishops; secondly, the Bishop of Rome is Patriarch of the West; thirdly, there is a claim to supremacy; and fourthly, there is the claim to infallibility. Let us take each of these points in succession:

First the claim to primacy. That, if it is clearly defined, is what no student of Church history and no member of the Church of England would deny. The Bishop of Rome was, from very early times, recognized as *primus inter pares*. He was the first Bishop of the Christian world, a position which he owed, as far as one can gather, mainly to the fact that Rome was the capital of the Empire, which was supported originally by the claim of Rome to be an Apostolic See as founded by St. Paul and St. Peter, and at a later date by the development of the Petrine claims. Now, if the Christian Church were to be reunited we should all agree to give that primacy to the Bishop of Rome, just as all bishops of the Anglican Church give a similar primacy to the Archbishop of Canterbury, although that does not give him any authority over other bishops. It is important that it should be recognized that we accept it and also what it means, because in the loose language which often characterizes much ecclesiastical writing an acceptance of this primacy would be held to imply a great deal more than it really does mean or should mean. It is the primacy which, I believe, prevailed during the first seven centuries of the Christian Church which gave to the Bishops of Rome a commanding position dependent upon their personal merits. It gave a sphere to a great man, and at the times of inferior men it ceased to be operative. It gave no authority apart from the authority of influence.

The second point which gave its position to the Bishop of Rome is that he is Patriarch of the West. Now I want quite definitely to suggest, looking to the future, that if any real union between Anglo-Saxon and Latin

Christianity is to take place, it must be recognized that a new patriarchate must be built up for the English-speaking world. There are some enthusiasts who are eager to restore to us the Latin rite and make the Church of England a uniform part of Latin Christianity. I think they have singularly little influence over the great majority of their fellow Churchmen. I am sure they are wrong. We have developed our own rite, our own representation and type of Christianity, our own customs and ways. To subordinate the English-speaking world to the Latin world is as grave a mistake as to subordinate the Russian and Slavonic to the Greek world. The same, of course, would have to be said about the Lutheran Christianity of Germany. I am sure that if it were recognized that the successor of St. Augustine was to be, as St. Augustine was styled, *Papa Alterius Orbis*, much of the preliminary difficulties which have been suggested would be done away with.

Then, thirdly, there is the question of Papal Supremacy. Here, quite definitely and decisively, I should feel bound to part company with Roman claims, and it is just the point where the somewhat vague language of Lord Halifax slurs over distinctions. So long as the Church of Rome was contented with a primacy, a primacy of honour and position, and with authority which depended upon its real spiritual influence, so long the Church remained united. It was in the ninth century that a development to something more than this began, and that the Bishop of Rome attempted to assert his authority over the Churches of the East, and it was that and nothing else which caused the disunion of Christendom. It was in the same way the attempted jurisdiction of the Pope over this country which caused the continuous controversies of the Middle Ages and ultimately led to the Reformation. The Church and people of England, in the reign of Henry VIII., repudiated the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Rome in this country; they neither denied his spiritual position nor did they separate themselves from him. The rest followed through the action of the Pope himself, who

excommunicated Henry VIII. and the English Church because they had refused to recognize his jurisdiction, and I do not see that it is possible in any way for us to recognize that jurisdiction, or to recognize the authority of the Bishop of Rome over this Church.

Then, fourthly, comes the question of Infallibility. We all know how that is explained, and it is quite possible to explain it away. The Pope is only infallible when he speaks in the name of the Church, and it has never been defined as to when he does speak in the name of the Church, so it is possible to uphold that he never has spoken in an infallible way, and that he is only infallible when he is expressing on his own authority what the Church has decreed. Now all these explanations are clever, but they are not convincing, and they do not touch upon the real evil of the decree of infallibility. What I want now is to point out the two great evils which come at the present time from the claim to infallibility and the claim to jurisdiction. They are the centralized government of the Church by a political body, the Roman Curia, and the destruction of liberty of thought by Papal action. Let us take these two: First of all the Papacy as a political power. The claim has been continuously made that it is by this political action that the strength of Christianity is shown. I should venture to think that nothing is less true. Whenever the action of the Christian body becomes political as opposed to the exercise of spiritual influence, its power becomes weaker and not stronger, and it often acts in a way which is evil. To take one or two examples. The apologists, since the war, have tried to excuse the Papal action during the war, but they have not really been successful. There can be no doubt that there was a definite policy in favour of the Germans and Austrians. It was described to me as an anti-democratic policy. The idea was that the German Emperor would assert, strongly and vigorously, the divine right of kings, that socialism and democracy would be suppressed with the authority of the Pope, and Italy would be restored once more to the Papacy by the Emperor from the North,

and that this authority might be used for the extension of the power of the Church of Rome. Of course, there were many who did not accept this standpoint; it brought the Roman Church almost to the verge of disunion; it caused some of the separations which have taken place since. But the evil of the centralized government and the claims to supremacy and jurisdiction of the Pope are shown in the fact that the whole Church is committed to this political action and finds great difficulty in opposing it.

Still more harmful has been the political influence which the Roman Curia has attempted to exercise to the detriment of the Eastern Churches. During the Peace Conference a definite claim was put forward to the Church of St. Sophia by Cardinal Gasquet. In all the negotiations that were carried on for safeguarding the position of the Greek Church in the East the influence of the Roman Curia was thrown on the other side. Intrigues with the Soviet Government of Russia began and were encouraged by that Government for a time, because it might weaken the power of Christianity by encouraging division. We all deplored the persecution of the Roman Church, as of the Eastern Church in Russia, but the Roman Church had really laid themselves out for it, as they were attempting to take advantage of the position in which the Eastern Church found itself to spread Roman influence in Russia. The Roman policy has been to try to extend the influence of the Church of Rome in the East through the exercise (as always) of French influence, and through breaking the power of Eastern Christians. It was the policy of the Fourth Crusade, it was the policy of the Jesuits at the time of Cyril Lucar, it is a policy which is disgraceful to Christianity.

Then, secondly, the Papal claims are continuously used as against religious liberty. I think we may safely say that if the turn of the political wheel gave the Roman Church supremacy in any country, the civil power would be used to promote its claims. It has not yet learnt the lesson of religious liberty. We have had difficulties of this sort in Malta, Madagascar, and other places, where

an attempt was made to use political action to suppress religious liberty.

Equally is this the case within the Roman community. Intellectual freedom is the sole condition under which it is possible to obtain a true grasp of Christianity. Lollardism in England, for example, was a crude attempt to solve social and religious problems. In an atmosphere of freedom its influence would have penetrated the Church. What was evil in it would have been thrown aside. The Church of England would have been gradually reformed. But Lollardism was suppressed, and the result was the Reformation. The Reformation throughout Europe arose from two causes: the failure of spiritual life in the Papacy and the suppression of freedom by Rome. It was because Rome laid greater stress on being a political power than a spiritual influence that the necessary reforms of the Church, which might quite well have taken place on the lines that Erasmus laid down, failed, and if that was the case then it is infinitely more the case now. Cardinal Mercier, and Lord Halifax following him, have dwelt upon the need of the Church to preserve the Christian faith. Cardinal Mercier, in his letter on *The Conversations of Malines*, quotes a statement of Cardinal Newman, written in 1877, in which he speaks of a period when infidelity will spread itself everywhere, and adds, " I speak especially of the Protestant world."

" Yes," he says, " especially in the Protestant world, because there the doctrinal differences of the confessions or denominations, which multiply there, deprive the religious consciousness of the illuminating and strengthening spectacle of the unity of the Faith. The disintegration of the Protestant communion leads to liberalism in matters religious—that is to say, to that sort of vague belief that all religions represent free opinions which are as good as each other because no one of them can claim for its advantage the proof of a positive and divine Revelation; as a consequence religious indifference inevitably leads to irreligion and anti-religious sectarianism."[1]

[1] *The Life of Newman*, II, By Wilfrid Ward. P. 416.

I do not think that this ever did represent the facts, but surely at the present time, whatever faults there may be in the Protestant world or in our Anglican world, the infidelity of the Latin races is far more serious. Nor has the Church of Rome done anything in any way commensurate with its position and numbers to help in the reconstruction of faith. If I want help in Biblical apologetics, if I want help in the many philosophical questions that have arisen, if I want help in dealing with Biblical criticism, I hardly ever find any in the Church of Rome, and the reason is that there has not been freedom. At the present time, in the French Church the reconciliation between the Church and the nation is hampered by the fact that there is no freedom of thought in the Church. Papal Bulls, which may not be infallible but which are claimed to be infallible, forbid the acceptance of even the most moderate claims of science when they conflict with Biblical tradition, forbid any serious consideration of the problems of Old Testament or New Testament criticism, and while they prevent the acceptance of even moderate modernist principles within the Church, do nothingto make faith easier for those without.

Nor has the universality of the Roman Church enabled them to do as much to mitigate the differences which the war aroused as has been accomplished by Evangelical Christians. Archbishop Söderblom points out:

"Having studied the publications on this matter in German and French, and having read the quoted article carefully twice, I am sorry to say that no single, truly supernational Roman Catholic gathering has convened since the war." (He was writing in 1923.) "If we do not count the single German pacifist present at Rotterdam, February 20, 1920, Marc Sangnier's meeting seems then to be the first of its kind. So little importance has organization. The most powerful, the most absolute ecclesiastical constitution existing has not been able to bring about what Evangelic Christianity, known, and badly known, for the divisions that were always observed by its adversaries, and regretted by its members, had already carried out long before."

He then goes on to enumerate what had been done by Evangelical Christianity, and concludes with:

"Perhaps we also get a presentiment that Evangelic Christendom with all its divisions has a higher degree of unity than outward appearance and public opinion give us to understand, and we dare to believe ourselves. We see at least that the most important thing is not to create organization and outward forms, but to have all over the world praying, ardent souls, who bind together our torn and struggling humanity with invisible, but effective chains of love."[1]

To sum up, then, the attitude which I believe the people would adopt towards Papal claims if Christendom were united. We should all give the primacy to the See of Rome, but it would be a primacy *inter pares*. We should ask, and I think it is the only possible condition on which reunion can take place, that our Anglo-Saxon Christianity should be organized as a separate patriarchate, or perhaps patriarchates; but as regards any claim to jurisdiction or any claim to infallibility, however they might be explained away, we could not recognize them. We could not recognize them because we do not think they are true in themselves, and because they have become the support of the political action of the Roman Church and of that opposition to religious liberty which, so far from strengthening the faith of Christ, have been serious impediments to the spread of the true faith.

II

We now pass to other points in our relations to the Church of Rome, and again let us have recourse to Lord Halifax's statement.

"With regard to the teaching of the Church of England, it has never accepted the Lutheran doctrine of the absolute corruption of human nature in consequence of the Fall, but has contented itself with saying that human nature,

[1] *Christian Fellowship*. By Nathan Söderblom, Archbishop of Upsala. Fleming H. Revill Company, London and Edinburgh. Pp. 167, 171.

since the Fall, is inclined to sin, which is something very different. The Catholic doctrine of Holy Baptism, by which we are made children of God and heirs of eternal life, is stated explicitly in the Anglican formularies (see the Office of Holy Baptism in the Book of Common Prayer), and the same thing is true of Confirmation, by which we are, so to speak, enlisted and armed as soldiers in the army of Christ. In regard to the Holy Eucharist, the Church of England teaches that in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper the Body and Blood of Christ are really given, taken, and received; that by the Holy Eucharist our spiritual life, bestowed in Baptism, is nourished and sustained; that by means of the Holy Sacrament Christ lives in us and we in Christ, and that by it His life on earth is sacramentally continued, and His promise fulfilled that He will not leave us comfortless, but will remain with us always, even to the end of the world. That the two Sacraments of Baptism and the Eucharist have always been considered necessary for all."[1]

He then describes, from his point of view, the Church of England doctrine of the Eucharistic sacrifice.

"That the Eucharistic sacrifice of the Mass is nothing else than the offering made by our Lord Jesus Christ to His Father, under the sacramental species of His Body and Blood, separated in a mystical manner, the one from the other, by the consecration, in memory of the death and blood-shedding which He suffered once for all upon the Cross for the sins of the whole world, past, present, and to come. That the Eucharist is the same sacrifice as that of the Cross offered by our Saviour Jesus Christ to His Father mystically."[2]

This memorandum was discussed with Cardinal Mercier, and we are told there was found to be a great measure of agreement on the specific points mentioned in it. That agreement appeared to cover:

"1. That Baptism constitutes the entry to the Church, that the initiation which is effected by Baptism must develop in an organic social life, and that the organized life is exhibited especially by the hierarchy and the Sacraments."

[1] *A Call to Reunion*, p. 5. [2] *Ibid.*, pp. 5, 6.

Passing over the question of the hierarchy for the moment, we come to the third point.

" 3. No difficulty appeared to occur as to Confirmation. In regard to the Holy Eucharist the words quoted in the memorandum, ' that the Body and Blood of Christ are verily and indeed given, taken, and received in the Holy Sacrament ' (the actual words of the Catechism supplemented by the 28th Article), excited no comment beyond that, if the members of the Church of England accept as true that, by reason of consecration, a change is made whereby the bread and wine become the Body and Blood of Christ, this, in the view of Roman Catholics, is the meaning of Transubstantiation. In reference to the Eucharistic sacrifice the statement in the memorandum that the Eucharist is the same sacrifice as that of the Cross, offered by our Lord Jesus Christ to His Father mystically, supplemented by a reference to (1) the Prayer of Oblation, ' O Lord our heavenly Father,' and (2) to part of the answer of the Archbishops of England to the Bull *Apostolicæ Curæ*, section 11, beginning, ' Further we truly teach,' gave rise to no comment."[1]

Perhaps we may add the words from the Archbishops' answer to the Apostolic Letter of Pope Leo XIII. on English ordinations.

". . . Further, we truly teach the doctrine of Eucharistic sacrifice and do not believe it to be a ' nude commemoration of the Sacrifice of the Cross,' an opinion which seems to be attributed to us by the quotation made from that Council. But we think it sufficient in the Liturgy which we use in celebrating the Holy Eucharist—while lifting up our hearts to the Lord, and when now consecrating the gifts already offered, that they may become to us the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ—to signify the sacrifice which is offered at that point of the service in such terms as these.

" We continue a perpetual memory of the precious death of Christ, Who is our Advocate with the Father and the propitiation for our sins, according to His precept, until His coming again.

" For first we offer the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving; then next we plead and represent before the

[1] *A Call to Reunion*, p. 9.

Father the sacrifice of the cross, and by it we confidently entreat remission of sins and all other benefits of the Lord's Passion for all the whole Church; and lastly, we offer the sacrifice of ourselves to the Creator of all things which we have already signified by the oblations of His creatures.

" This whole action, in which the people has necessarily to take its part with the priest, we are accustomed to call the Eucharistic Sacrifice."

Although the teaching of Lord Halifax represents the Church of England teaching only from one point of view, I do not think that there is anything in it inconsistent with our formulas or disloyal to our position, and the deduction that we may arrive at is this: That if the two Churches approached one another from a friendly point of view, and if neither side were to be anxious to impose its own formulas on the other, there is a real and substantial agreement between us, and if the difficulties with regard to the Papal position did not exist intercommunion between the two Churches would be quite possible, if people wished it. I would go so far as to say, as representing my own point of view, that supposing by any chance it were to happen that the French Church should repudiate the supremacy of the Pope in the same way that the Church of England did in the sixteenth century, and should do it without any change of doctrine at all, I do not believe that there would be any sound reason why intercommunion should not be restored between the two Churches.

But I think we must go a little further than we have done, and I want now to compare the teaching which has just been given with the point of view represented by educated and thoughtful Presbyterians such as Dr. Carnegie Simpson. The Sacraments, he tells us, are things of the Gospel.

" The Sacraments focus on and are confined to the very central and the ultimate truths of the Gospel, and to the primary and essential realities of the Christian life. What these ultimate truths and essential realities are was

NORWICH PUBLIC LIBRARIES

indicated in the opening section of this chapter about the Gospel. To begin with is the character of God—His love and fatherly care for His children. Well, there is a little child, who knows nothing of God and can bring or give nothing to God; and the Sacrament of Baptism writes that child's name among God's family, and God's care and love and grace are pledged to it. Or, again, there is the matter of forgiveness of sin. Well, there, in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, is the Bread broken and there is the Wine poured out, and these things done in Christ's name—done, verily, by Christ—are the Gospel of the redemption wrought for us by the Saviour at untellable cost. Once again, there is the soul's need of grace and strength for life. Well, look still at that Communion ritual, and see there the Bread eaten and the Wine drunk, and that is the Gospel that Christ is our life and that the souls of His people feed on Him. All the Gospel—and nothing but the Gospel—is in these things. And it is in them not merely a picture or sign, but as reality; for, I repeat, Christ is always there really to do what these outward elements and actions show. It is this which has given especially to the Sacrament of the Eucharist an imperishable value and power, even when it has been distorted by human error."[1]

Then, again, when he compares the Mass with Communion in his Church:

"The Missal of the Roman Church is a structure which no enlightened Christian mind can study unimpressed, and the moment in it when the priest, on behalf of the people, holds up to God the oblation of the Host is a moment which has been sacred for generations to millions of faithful and adoring Christians. But, quite deliberately and not in any controversial spirit, I will say that that is an even greater moment when, in the simplest evangelical ritual of Communion, the minister, being Christ's minister, speaking and acting not for the people towards God, but for Christ towards the people—and therefore rightly, as in the primitive Church, facing them—says, 'This is My Body,' and Christ, Who through His unworthy servant is the Celebrant, gives Himself to believing and living souls. Christ Himself speaking, Christ Himself blessing, Christ Himself giving—that is the supreme sacramental thing."[2]

[1] *Church Principles*, pp. 98, 99. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 105.

And then he speaks of the doctrine of the "Real Presence."

"The last sentence leads me to say a word on what is called 'the Real Presence.' It is a mistaken and a serious misrepresentation to assume or assert that what I have been describing as the sacramental—as distinguished from the sacrificial—view of the Eucharist denies that Christ is verily present in the service of this sacred rite. So far is this from being the case, that I say unhesitatingly that it is in the evangelical Sacrament rather than in the sacrificial Mass that we have the larger and worthier conception of Christ's presence. It is a greater thought that He is present in the entire Sacrament than that He is located in the elements which are but a part of it; that He is in it from the beginning than that He comes at the moment of the consecration; and—what is more important than either of these points—that He is here not as the offered oblation but as the Celebrant. This is the greater doctrine of the Real Presence. Especially should we assert the last position—that Christ is truly the Celebrant. It is both a nobler conception and one far less open to materialistic error to say that Christ is in the evangelical *acts* of the Sacrament than to identify His presence with the material elements which are—I use the word without irreverence—the apparatus of it. It is Christ Who *speaks*, Who *blesses*, Who *breaks*, Who *gives*. What these actions say and do, He really says and does. That is the Sacramental meaning of the presence, and it is real as the acts themselves are. It is a living Christ Who is present in the Sacrament; and everything which is sacramental in it, He does."[1]

I think if anyone compares these different views of the Eucharist and the Eucharistic Sacrament he will begin to wonder whether there is any need for Christians to be separated from one another as they are. It is quite true that if we once begin to define we can never unite, but if we look at everything from the point of view of worship, I am sure that there is as much sacramental reality in many Evangelicals as there is in High-Churchmen or Roman Catholics. I think, indeed, we want to

[1] *Ibid.*, pp. 106-108.

improve our theology a little. Much of what Dr. Carnegie Simpson says, at any rate from the positive side, can be definitely paralleled from St. Thomas Aquinas. If we were to build up our theology on St. Augustine and the best patristic teaching and on St. Thomas Aquinas and the best mediæval teaching, we should find that there is a great deal of crudeness about much of our modern language. I have always maintained that the basis of reunion in all sacraments is to recognize that what the Church has to guard is the proper celebration. If that is guarded we can leave each theologian and each worshipper to define the meaning of the rite in his own way. If we attempt to define we shall repel many and drive many into negation; if we are content with worshipping we shall unite in the fulfilment of our Lord's command.

It will be more convenient to take the whole question of the hierarchy in connection with our next section in relation to Nonconformity. I will conclude this part of my subject with a few remarks on our personal relations to Roman Catholics at the present time. We must recognize that in the Roman Church there are markedly two elements at the present day. There is a hard and intolerant shell; there is within that hard shell an extraordinary fund of religious piety; there is, especially amongst a certain section in this country, an element of fanaticism, an excessive desire for proselytism which drives its members to a great deal of what often seems to us, at any rate, underhanded and deceitful. There is, on the other hand, a real earnestness of religious life. Do not think that we must meet intolerance with intolerance, or an over-eagerness for proselytizing and for seeking to extend the Church by means which seem to us almost dishonourable by adopting similar methods ourselves. We must lose no opportunity for meeting its members in a friendly and charitable and religious spirit. There are in this diocese places where the Roman Church is exhibited in its least favourable aspect. It sometimes presents a very difficult problem; but the more fair and

honourable and courteous we are, even in the face of provocation, the less possible will an opposite attitude on their part be. Often—and I know it well—we can meet them on the same religious basis as we can members of our own Church.

III

Let us now pass to the relations of the Church of England and Nonconformity in this country. Here the notable facts during the last two or three years have been the Conferences which have been going on at Lambeth between representatives of the Church of England and leading Nonconformists. As one who has taken part in those Conferences, I can speak with some authority on the matter. The result of them has been put forward in a pamphlet, with which most of you are acquainted, called *Reunion: The Lambeth Conference Report and the Free Churches*.[1] I have already quoted the definitions of the Church and the ministry that have been put forward. The members of the Conference on both sides are able to approach one another as trained theologians, knowing the limitations as well as the teaching of their Churches, and between them a greater amount of unity has become possible than there might be at the present time between many other members of the same religious bodies. In particular, it is often, I think, the earnest layman, whose interests are centred in his own particular community and who has not had the opportunity of studying its teaching from outside, who will have the greatest difficulty in recognizing the amount of agreement there is and in changing a little his point of view.

The main difficulty at the present time is the question of the recognition of the orders of the present Nonconformist ministers. The Conference (I do not say the followers on either side) has agreed on episcopal ordination as the Church order of a united community. The Conference has agreed to recognize existing Nonconformist ministers as ministers of the Word and Sacrament, and the Anglican members practically admit the validity

[1] London: S.P.C.K., 1924.

of the orders although doubting their regularity. The question on which difficulties arise at the present time is: What place in the United Church would be occupied by those who, at the present time, have not received episcopal ordination? On the one side, there are many members of the Anglican Church at the present day who would feel that their admission to celebrate in our churches would be, to put it on its lowest basis, a grave breach of Catholic discipline. On the other hand, the Nonconformist ministers are, as I believe quite rightly, determined not to do anything to deny the validity of their own spiritual administrations, which they know have been abundantly blessed in the past.

I am now going to leave that for a moment and look at the question from different standpoints, and I will begin again with Lord Halifax's exposition in putting forward the teaching of the Church of England. He states:

"That by episcopal ordination the Holy Spirit is given to those who receive Holy Orders, and that none but a priest can celebrate the Holy Eucharist or give Absolution. That every legitimate bishop must be able to show an uninterrupted descent and succession from the Apostles, and that, as the Church of England is a daughter of the Church of Rome, having received her later Christianity from Pope Gregory the Great and St. Augustine, a duty devolves upon her, equally with Rome, to strive, without sacrificing the truth, to restore the relations which once bound them together."[1]

And then, in the discussion on the Memorandum with Cardinal Mercier, it seems to have been agreed that the hierarchy who derive from the Apostles, from an uninterrupted succession, should by virtue of this succession hold their position of divine right. He then goes on:

"If it be recognized, as was explicitly done by Leo XIII., that the episcopate derives its jurisdiction directly from God, what need hinder us from acknowledging that our Lord contemplated for the Church an episcopate acting, not in submission to, but in union with, the Apostle upon

[1] *A Call to Reunion*, p. 6.

whom He had bestowed the gift of the keys? 'For the successor of St. Peter,' as Bishop Gore has said, 'to be something other bishops are not is surely a very different thing from the successor of St. Peter being to other bishops the source of what they are.' As Archbishop Bramhall says: 'Concerning Order or interior jurisdiction, I know of no controversy between the Church of Rome and us but one—whether the Bishop of Rome alone does derive his jurisdiction immediately from Christ and all other bishops do derive theirs from him.' Acknowledgments should not be difficult on both sides. The bishops in communion with Canterbury, if other things can be agreed upon, have declared their willingness to accept, with regard to Holy Orders, whatever may regularize their position in the eyes of the Roman and Oriental Churches, in the same way as we are asking the Presbyterians to regularize their position in our eyes."[1]

Let us now take another point of view, that represented by Dr. Carnegie Simpson. He insists, first of all, on the far-reaching idea: the essential and unalienable priesthood of the whole Church of Christ.

"That is a dwarfed and mutilated sacerdotalism, dating practically from Cyprian, which thinks of priestliness as the peculiar character of the clerical order. . . . The whole Church, and not only or specially the clerical section of it, is 'the priesthood.' This, of course, does not mean that the Church may not have and should not have its ministry to act as—the phrase is Dr. Moberly's—'ministerial organs of the Church's priesthood.' . . . The thing to perceive at present is that its place is not primary, nor is it this ministry which is constitutive of the sacerdotal character of the Christian religion in sacrament or absolution or anything else. In a word, it is not ordination which makes the priest: it is redemption."[2]

He then goes on to speak of the ministry. The Christian ministry, he holds, is representative of the Church, but it is much more than this:

"It is representative of the Church in certain things, but it is representative of more than the Church. There is than this a far higher thought of the ministry.

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 19. [2] *Church Principles*, p. 64.

"The higher thought of the ministry is that it is directly Christ's ministry. . . . The commission of the ministry, then, is more than a delegation to representative function on behalf of the Church. As we have seen, it does speak and act for the Church as a corporate body; but the Christian minister also speaks and acts directly in the Name of Christ."[1]

And again:

"The Christian minister should always think of his ministry as, in the Apostle's phrase, 'the ministry which I have received of the Lord Jesus.' It is, no doubt, an ecclesiastical commission to speak and act in things which belong to the corporate society. But it is more. It is a direct vocation from Christ to speak and act as His minister. 'We are ambassadors,' said the greatest Christian minister who ever lived, 'on behalf of Christ, as though God were entreating by us: we beseech you on behalf of Christ.'"[2]

He then goes on to speak about ordination, and discusses what is the thing in ordination about which the Church should be most conscientious, and on which it should expend its chief care.

"There are many persons to whom the thing in ordination about which meticulous care must be shown is some detail—some external and even physical detail—in the manner and method of the ritual ceremony. I by no means ignore or despise order in such things, which has its due place and value. But if the main idea in ordination be to recognize and ratify a vocation already received from Christ, then it is manifest that the great thing about which a Church should be most careful is *that the man to be ordained really is a man God has called and chosen*. . . . The call of the Christian people attesting a true vocation of God is 'material for ordination.'"[3]

The essence, then, with him in an ordination is not the laying on of hands but the call of the people. And as regards succession he says:

[1] *Church Principles*, pp. 69, 70. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 71.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 75.

"Further, I appreciate the idea of 'succession,' which is not necessarily confined to episcopalians. But this whole theory of resting one's ministry on this long and, in some of its links, soiled chain is not religiously near enough nor historically certain enough for me to rest my ministry on. It is neither immediate in experience nor indisputable in fact, as the other view is. The Apostles are dead and have been dead a long time and are far away: the commissioning call of Christ is as living and as close as my own soul. The succession from bishop to bishop . . . or from presbyter to presbyter, inscribed on the often illegible and not always reliable scroll of history, is a long and obscure story from which at least the possibility of error or defect cannot be excluded; the living Church exists and has assuredly never died. In a word, I am closer to Christ than I am to the Apostles, and I am surer of the Church than anyone can be of the succession."[1]

There we have a thoughtful Presbyterian point of view, and now let me pass to the Lutheran standpoint as represented by Archbishop Söderblom, who himself belongs to an Episcopal Church. He lays stress upon the value of the episcopacy and the value of the succession:

"We look upon our Church's special forms and traditions, not only with a pious regard which is due to an honourable heritage from our forebears, but as an endowment, entrusted to us by the God of history. . . . There is in our section of the Church no room for the slightest doubt about the unbroken continuity of what has been called apostolic succession. . . . Episcopacy," he says, "is a consecration for lifetime to an effective responsibility. . . . It symbolizes the independence of the spiritual communion. . . . The bishop as such does not belong only to the one nation or the other, to the one religious body or the other. The Moravians sought for episcopal ordination in the Waldensian Church because they considered the episcopate as a bond between themselves and the universal Church."[2]

He draws our attention to the fact that since the Revolution episcopacy has been adopted in Esthonia, Latvia, Saxony, and Mecklenburg amongst people who

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 83. [2] *Christian Fellowship*, p. 126.

have adopted a radically democratic order of self-government. On the other hand, he would lay stress on the mistake, from the Lutheran point of view, of looking upon any particular form of Church order as the essential thing. There is to be in the visible Church a rich diversity of life and worship. The frontiers of Christianity are not between episcopal and non-episcopal communities; they are not between episcopal and non-episcopal Methodists. Did the Church in Esthonia, or in Latvia, or in Saxony cross the frontiers when their superintendents became bishops? One can find advantages and disadvantages in every form of Church organization. None is ideal. God has led us in different paths. Each has special experiences to preserve and make use of. Unity ought not to be uniformity. It would then be poorer. The real difference lies, he tells us, not between episcopal and non-episcopal, but between those who look upon a particular form of Church government as essential and those who recognize that both unity and religion depend upon something very different.

I have tried in these extracts to put before you the different points of view which are represented by the High Anglican and Romanist, by the Presbyterian, and the Episcopal Lutheran, and I venture to think, if we are going to work for and aim at reunion, our task will ultimately become easier if we have the many diversified points of view before our mind. I think, in the first place, we want to be quite sure of our theology. I have already argued about the mistaken idea of the apostolic succession which is taught at the present time, and I am sure that if we are willing to model our theology on that of the Primitive Church, or even some of the greatest schoolmen, we shall not put the merely mechanical question of apostolic succession in the forefront. We shall recognize that whatever value this succession has, and it has an historical value which certainly appeals to our imagination, it is not what makes a ministry valid, but a result of a well-ordered ministry. It is not that the ministry depends on the succession, but the succession on the ministry.

Then, secondly, I would point out to you how important

it is to recognize that the validity of a ministry does not depend upon episcopacy. Lord Halifax would clearly rule out non-episcopal ministries as invalid, but if that were done I do not think that we should ever succeed in uniting the different communities. If, on the other hand, we are prepared to recognize sincerely and fully the spiritual validity of non-episcopal orders, then I think we shall find that the objection to episcopacy will vanish. It is not episcopacy that is objected to, it is the exclusive claims of episcopacy. In the present troubled state of the world's affairs it is felt more and more that a strong organization is necessary for the stability of a Christian Church. The Lutheran Churches of Germany which had the support of the State, now they are separated from it and no longer have that to assist them, feel that they require something stronger, and, as we have seen, they are tending towards episcopacy, a tendency which has materialized in some districts in Germany, and exists in others. Speaking, too, of the French Reformed Church, Dr. Schweitzer impresses upon me the fact that thoughtful people in Alsace felt the need of the strength which episcopacy would give, but the mass of the people were frightened by anything which seemed to approach to Catholicism.

Now I believe that the problem of the relation of the orders of different Churches to one another will more easily solve itself if we can look at the question as a whole. We certainly have no intention of uniting with the Church of Rome unless Rome recognizes our orders. Protestants and English Nonconformists will never unite with us unless we recognize their orders; the same is true of the Lutheran Churches on the Continent. The Eastern Church, or some of its more important branches, have already recognized Anglican orders. But in no case would the recognition necessarily and at once mean that those who were thus recognized should immediately be admitted to celebrate the Eucharist in other bodies. We have to make allowance for inherited prejudice; each ministers according to a different rite and order. If

we Anglicans come to think of it, we do not want, and we are not qualified, to say Mass in a Roman church, to celebrate the Liturgy in a Greek church, or to preside at the breaking of bread in a Presbyterian or Nonconformist place of worship. If all those bodies recognized our orders we should not wish to do this, and I think that holds true universally. Supposing there was intercommunion between us and the Greek Church, or us and the Latin Church, their priests might communicate at our altars, but they would not wish to celebrate according to our rite, nor, I think, would the Presbyterian or Congregational or Lutheran minister wish to do so either. I believe the time will surely come when we and others also will recognize that there is a bold and a wise course. Let us agree frankly and freely to recognize one another's orders; let us agree freely to communicate, at any rate occasionally, at one another's altars, and let us agree in all future ordinations to regularize one another's orders according to the traditional custom of the Christian Church. There is no need to disturb the prejudices of others by asking to celebrate where we are not qualified to do so; and if this action becomes universal in every direction there will be no disrespect shown to anyone's ministry, but we shall have laid the foundations of a more complete union in the future.

IV

I pass now to the relations of the Church of England with Continental Protestantism. Let us remember that this is something much more important than we have been inclined to realize. As Archbishop Söderblom reminds us:

"The Lutheran country consists of the Scandinavian, Finnish, and Baltic North, and Evangelic Germany with neighbouring Lutheranism in Poland, Czecho-Slovakia, Austria, Hungary, Roumania, Jugo-Slavia, France, and Holland," and then there is "the second and smaller centre of Lutheranism situated in the United States and numbering twelve to thirteen millions of souls."[1]

[1] *Christian Fellowship*, p. 115.

It is probably true in fact that there are more Lutherans in the United States than there are members of the Episcopal Church.

The relations of the Church of England to this body of Christians have been intermittently friendly, but it must be recognized that the Church of England has been singularly little influenced by Lutheranism. It is true that the original Augsburg Confession and the personality of Melanchthon had some importance in the early days of the Reformation, but it is rather Melanchthon the humanist than Melanchthon the Lutheran that influenced the Church of England; and so far as Continental Protestantism affected our history, it was the Calvinism of Geneva and Strasburg which impressed itself on the Marian exiles, and exercised a strong influence in the reign of Queen Elizabeth. Since then it has had no wide influence on the English Church, and not very much even upon our English Nonconformists. Neither the specific Lutheran doctrine of justification by faith nor the specific Calvinistic doctrine of predestination have ever really been assimilated in any section of the English community. Wesleyanism, the most emotional type of English Nonconformity, is quite different in its essence to Lutheranism.

In the early days of Queen Victoria, under the influence of the Prince Consort, attempts were made to bring the State Church of Prussia into closer union with the Church of England, but the methods adopted were not in the least of a character to appeal to English people. The Jerusalem Bishopric scheme aroused fierce opposition in the growing Anglo-Catholic movement, and the growth of German rationalism helped to alienate religious England. Of recent years the approach towards Lutheranism has begun in a different direction. It is recognized now that amongst Episcopal Lutherans the Church of Sweden has preserved many of its traditions and the true succession of its bishops, and although formal recognition on either side between the Church of England and the Swedish Church does not seem to have taken

place, and there has been perhaps a certain amount of hesitation in carrying out in practice what we have agreed to in principle, yet on the basis of the Lambeth quadrilateral, and as the result of historical investigation, it has become recognized that the Lutheran Church of Sweden has all the conditions which would make reunion and intercommunion possible, and English bishops have taken part in the consecration of a Swedish bishop. Moreover, the striking and dominant vigour of Archbishop Söderblom has impressed itself on the international mind in a way which few ecclesiastics have done in recent years. The tendency of the Lutheran Church at the present time is towards the re-establishment of episcopacy, and I cannot but think that it might be wise for us boldly to go forward and help.

What I should like now is to illustrate, from the presentment of Lutheranism which Archbishop Söderblom gives us, some of the characteristics of a separate type of Christianity. Lutheranism is not Anglicanism, but if Anglicanism is to have its place in the religious life of the world we must recognize that Lutheranism and the Lutheran temperament must have their place also. We have been, in recent years, politically enemies of Germany. The growth of much of the modern German spirit, of its philosophy, its commercial materialism, its religious rationalism, has ceased to attract us. But we cannot but remember what the religious world has owed to Germany. Some of our finest hymns have come from German sources; the great bulk of the most inspiring Church music is German; the traditional type of German piety is something which ought not to be forgotten, and is, we may hope, reviving in its own homeland. The contribution of Germany to theological learning, if it needs correcting and sifting, is on a magnificent scale which no other nation has approached. There has been, to our minds, a crudity in much German work. The German mind has an extraordinary power of being absorbed in one aspect of a question and carrying it to extravagant extremes, but there has been, in the last hundred years, and even

earlier, a greatness of output in Germany with which neither we nor any other nation can compete. Now let us hear what Archbishop Söderblom says:

"The history and the divisions of the Church have strongly emphasized the central position of Rome, Geneva, and Wittenberg, for, as a non-German and non-Lutheran writer has said, the history of mankind once wended its way along the long, broad highway leading from the Augustine monastery to the castle in Wittenberg. Mankind will never forget this journey. By rights, the whole of Occidental Christendom should have pressed forward on this road, as it once followed St. Augustine, St. Bernard, and St. Francis, but faint or foolish hearts stopped behind. The ways parted. Then new ways have been struck out. Truth and spirit mean more than external unity. Divisions have not seldom meant fresh spiritual power, a necessity, and a progress. Is it God's plan that the roads shall meet? Is Wittenberg, now regarded by the greater part of Christendom as a sign of discord, to become a sign of reconciliation? . . .

"Rome is the name of the strongest and most important institution known to the religious history of the world. Wittenberg and Geneva, on the other hand, represent the Word and personalities penetrated by the Word: the German prophet of Christendom and his follower, the great Frenchman, who developed Luther's free and unbounded faith in God into an imposing theological system, and into a world-conquering moral rule and Church organization.

"Will the reconciliation of the Church take place in the sign of Rome or in the sign of Wittenberg?

"The Roman method," he tells us, "is the method of absorption. There are in Christendom many little sects which in their confessional as well as institutional exclusiveness and perfection expect all Christians to think, act, and organize themselves exactly as they do. Such communions claim for themselves a monopoly of salvation and divine recognition. According to this view, the unity of the Church can only be accomplished by all the other communions' abolishing their holy doctrines and ceremonies in order to join the only saving sect. If the great Evangelic sections ever put forward such a claim they have long ago dismissed it to the lumber-room—being inspired by the message of love and faith, the

message preached of old by the Saviour and St. Paul and revived in the Church from time to time. But this absorbing unity is insisted upon by Rome, perhaps more in the name of the institution than in the name of the doctrine."[1]

As against this method of absorption Archbishop Söderblom has put before us Luther's method:

" ' To form sects serves no good purpose, and does not help,' said Luther in his *Invocavit* sermons. Luther's act of burning the decretals and—with trembling hand—the Papal Bull of excommunication may be interpreted thus: ' It was said by them of old time: Thou shalt live according to statutes; but I say unto you, Thou shalt live by faith in freedom and love.' When he came back to Wittenberg in March, 1522, from Wartburg to preach through his *Invocavit* week, fulfilling his purely spiritual calling with wonderfully courageous devotion and lucidity, then this meant: ' You who say: " We must break the statutes and abolish them," you believe that you preach reformation. But I say unto you: ' You remain slaves of the old order of things.' ' No commandment must be made out of freedom.' ' For faith without love is not enough, nay, it is no faith, but a semblance of faith.' "[2]

And to give one more extract:

" The fact—again revealed to us by Luther—that the condition for our salvation is quite free from any form of law, will remain our sacred inheritance, never to be relinquished, which—for the sake of the peace of our souls —we cannot and must not in any way belittle or obscure."[3]

Clearly, this aspect of Christianity, and we might illustrate it by further extracts, is something different from our sober English traditions, as it is from the Roman traditions. It is no doubt one-sided, but we are all one-sided, and a Church which bases its teaching on the Lutheran aspect of Christianity can demand its right to exist, but it should not exist in isolation. It is the fact that all these different aspects of Christianity are

[1] *Christian Fellowship*, pp. 119-121.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 122.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 124.

existing in isolation and not in union with one another that causes these Christian divisions. A Catholic Church would be one which embraced and included different aspects.

V

I come, lastly, to the relations of the Church of England to the Eastern Church. I have treated these very fully in the past in a paper on *The Church of England and the Eastern Churches*, first published in *Church Problems* in 1900, edited by the present Bishop of Durham, and then reproduced in 1909 in *History, Authority, and Theology*, and I do not intend to cover the ground which I there covered. What is important to remember is that from the seventeenth century onwards the Church of England has shown increasing interest in the Eastern Churches. To illustrate its importance in relation to our own position, let me quote what I then wrote:

"Yet the existence of the Eastern Church is a very significant fact. It is, in the first place, a strong support of the position of the English Church. The Church of England has in the West the strength, but also the weakness, of its position as a *via media*. It seems to many a very unreal compromise. It claims to be something different from the Protestant Churches, yet it is not Roman. Its position has been gained by a process which appears somewhat artificial. It is true that it can appeal to a long line of learned men, both its own and those attracted from other countries. The result of modern discovery does not make us in the least inclined to distrust our position. But certainly in the West we are isolated. It is then a great gain to appeal to a Church whose claim to Catholicity, to an historical position, cannot be doubted, and which on the fundamental point is decisively on the side of the English Church. The point is (we may omit details), the acceptance of a position which implies the appeal to historical Christianity, which best preserves the traditions and order of the Primitive Church, but denies absolutely the supremacy, the authority and the infallibility of Rome. As against Rome, the East is far more vigorous and assertive than we are; its controversy is not always wise or charitable, but both its position and

its claims to that position are clear and decisive. On the other hand, in preserving the traditions of the Primitive Church on questions of order, organization, liturgical worship, it again takes the same line and attitude as the Church of England does, and that either against Rome or against what is commonly called Protestantism. There are differences. No attempt has been made to minimize or deny them in this essay. They are by no means unimportant. On some points one Church may be right, on some points the other. The Church of England has sufficient warning to caution it against any claims to infallibility. But, compared with the points of difference, the points of agreement are far greater and more important. The agreement is one of logical position; the differences lie in the interpretation of that position. We need not press the agreement further than it will go, but we cannot be blind to its significance."[1]

Since that was written much has happened. On the one side our relations with the Eastern Churches have become closer; on the other, the great tragedy of Eastern Christendom, whether in Russia in the North or in Turkey in the South, is one of the most appalling events of the day. The massacre of Smyrna in the South, which might have been prevented but for the fatal disunion of the West; the terrible persecutions of the Russian Church by Bolshevism, have created a position which may produce we know not what. It may be true, I have no doubt it is, that there was much in Russia which demanded the cleansing flame of persecution, and the religious strength of the Church has become apparent in its afflictions. But the disunion and failure of the Greek nation is even a greater calamity, for it implies great moral failure.

On the religious side, the most important event has been the recognition of Anglican orders by a considerable part of the Eastern Church and the friendly relations which have been formed with many branches of that Church. But I think it wise to quote a criticism which comes from Archbishop Söderblom concerning our relations with the East:

[1] *History, Christianity, and Theology*, pp. 183, 184.

"Not seldom," he writes, "ideas of a closer alliance between the Anglican and the Orthodox communions are based more on abstract discussion of the ancient creeds and liturgies than on real penetration of the religious spirit and of the state of things in the East and in the West."[1]

I am not quite certain that that is so true now. There has been a good deal of experience in the war which has made a difference, but we must realize that there are very fundamental differences between East and West. There is one thing I should feel it important to deprecate, and that is the attempt which is made by some of our people to approach the Eastern Church under what are really false colours. You will remember that the authorities of the English Church Union issued a document in which they stated the teaching of the Church of England in terms of the Eastern Church. That position is one we cannot take and ought not to take. We do not teach things in the same way; we do not do so in our formulas, still less do we do so in our spirit, and there is an extraordinary difference in spirit between East and West. But further than that, I believe that any attempt to make out the Church of England to be different to what it really is does harm to Christianity as a whole. We have, and it is our duty to present, our own Christianity as we have inherited and as we know it, and the reason why other Churches will come to us is not because we imitate them, but because they find something in us which they have not got. The Eastern Church is beginning to find itself faced with the same problems of criticism and of philosophy that we have had to face, and if it comes to us for help it will be, not in order to see itself in us, but to get from us something which it has not got. It is foolish for us to pretend that we teach things in the same unintelligent way as has often been done in the East, exactly at the moment when the Eastern Church wishes to break away from that unintelligence.

My review of our relations to other religious bodies has

[1] *Christian Fellowship*, p. 117.

extended itself to a length greater than was perhaps legitimate, but the subject has always been of interest to me, and I would only in conclusion urge upon you three things.

The first is study. It is only by deeper theological learning that we shall be able to conciliate the theological differences which separate one body of Christians from another. You cannot do it by superficial compromise; you can do it only by a deeper knowledge of what is true.

The second that I would urge you to is a continuance of real prayer for Christian unity. If we were all praying with our hearts for Christian unity, Christian unity would come very speedily.

And thirdly, that, so far as is possible, in all our dealings with those of other religious denominations we should show ready courtesy and charity. There will be need of controversy sometimes; we should not shrink from controversy, but we should be careful that our controversy is fair and is not in its methods un-Christian.

CHAPTER IX

THE MISSION OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

In my address to you to-day I come to the concluding part of my charge, in which I shall try and sum up some of the results of my previous investigations. It is an inconvenience attaching to this system of delivering a charge in different centres to different bodies of clergy that any coherence in it must necessarily be lost. To-day I find myself addressing to you the conclusions which I have arrived at on a number of points which I have investigated on previous days. The process, however, is inevitable if the charge is to be adequate, for I do not think anyone would have the patience to listen to all nine sections. I may say that I hope the charge may be published in the autumn, and that I shall be able to put in the hands of every one of my clergy a copy, and I would suggest that they should give their churchwardens an opportunity of reading it.

I

My subject to-day is the mission of the Church of England. I would suggest to you that our primary duty is to remember that we are a national Church and that our first duties are to the nation. The Church of England has had a large part in building up the English nation, and the English people, on the other side, have done much towards forming some of the main characteristics of the English Church; it has been one of the most potent influences in our national development, and it shows everywhere the marks of its origin. And this fact, I think, puts prominently before us our duties; we are appointed not to minister to one section of the people or to those who are most anxious to receive our ministrations, but to

the whole of the people in the parish to which we are assigned, and we should never allow the interests or tastes of a section of the people to hide from us our duty towards the whole. And if that is our duty, it imposes upon us also the obligation of so presenting the message we have to tell that it will appeal to those people to whom we are going. We have to preach the Gospel of Christ, and we must be certain we are preaching that Gospel truly, that we preach it in the way which will appeal to the people to whom we come, and our earnest care should be to adapt it to them.

That is our main duty. But rising out of that there are certain broad questions which demand some investigation. The first of these is the question of the Establishment. The relations of Church and State in England are the result of a long historical process. A few incidents in that process have been illustrated. I had hoped to be able to devote more time to the detailed examination of those questions, but I found that other things of perhaps greater interest drove it out.

Throughout the Middle Ages the interest of the kings in the Church was great. It was a double interest. On the one hand, those who were most concerned with the well-being of the people recognized the Church as a great instrument for benefiting them; on the other hand, the Church was a strong and powerful society, and no ruler who wished to rule his country could neglect it. It was inevitable that the king should demand the right to make appointments to positions so important and so powerful as were the bishops and the great abbots. I think it is important that we should remember this. At the present time there are many people who have visions of a Church entirely free from State control; I do not think any central government would allow such a powerful body to exist without having some control over it in some directions. The Crown or the State would, I think, demand the right to appoint to bishoprics and other important positions, simply because it could not allow such a powerful body to exist in complete independence. So long as Christianity

is weakened by division, so long, perhaps, would complete, or apparently complete, disestablishment be possible, but in the case of a united Church, some measure of State regulation would be inevitable.

At the time of the Reformation and the repudiation of the Papal authority, a change, of course, was made. Much of the power which was vested in the Pope was transferred to the Crown, and Henry VIII., as is well known, described himself as supreme head. At the time he was accused of taking to himself spiritual functions. It is certainly interesting and remarkable how careful the English Crown was not to arrogate to itself anything which was the proper function of the bishops; some of the Continental rulers deliberately acquired for themselves rights which could only belong to the clergy. We may note that Bishop Tunstall, who wrote almost directly after the change, is quite explicit on this point. He tells us Henry VIII. knew his duty to the Church as well as anyone, and that he had no desire to take upon himself anything that was the function of the clergy. But, having said that, we must recognize that Henry was a man who was determined to have his own way, and that the control which he exercised and claimed to exercise over the Church was, in fact, tyrannical. When the royal supremacy was revived in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, some of the mistakes of Henry VIII. were avoided. A new formula was devised and the sovereign was to be over all causes, ecclesiastical as well as civil, supreme. It was made clear that the supremacy of the sovereign was in no way in sacred things. The disadvantages of the State control of the Church of England have been, so far, much more the negative than the positive; the actual control exercised, at any rate since the year 1660, has not encroached upon the spiritual functions of the Church. But the fact that Parliament has been the sole legislative power, and that Parliament is more concerned with secular than ecclesiastical things, has led to a somewhat chaotic state of Church law. There has been no body which has been competent to modify the law

or customs of the Church to suit the altered conditions. It is not the control of the State, but the fact that the Church has been deprived of self-government, which has caused so much difficulty. While the Church in Scotland, although established by the State, kept its General Assembly and preserved a considerable power of legislation, the Church of England has had no such representative body until the creation within recent years of the Church Assembly. Such a representative body it now possesses, and I do not imagine that it will be found in the future that any serious limitation of its powers arises from establishment.

The most important point in the establishment is the appointment of bishops. In the days of the early Church the bishops were elected by the whole society, and we have some interesting descriptions of the way in which this took place. But it is important to note how gradually this power passed into other hands, mainly because the community was not a suitable body to make such elections. We have accounts of the violent methods which were sometimes pursued in Rome at Papal elections; we are told that on more than one occasion men were killed in the contests of rival candidates. It was for this reason that the power was transferred to the Roman Presbyters, who are now represented by the College of Cardinals. In most of the other branches of the Church of England the election of bishops is vested, in some form or other, in the Synod of the Church. So far as one can judge, this method is not really successful. It is not the best men, as a rule, who are appointed, but often men of inferior ability. I do not believe that any better method could be found at the present time than the method which prevails in the Church of England. The appointment by the King on the advice of the Prime Minister may be said to represent the great body of Church people better than any of the particular methods adopted elsewhere. Election by Synod is really far less popular and far less representative than election by someone who represents the people of the country as efficiently as they

can be represented. Whether as regards care of selection or capacity for obtaining full and accurate information, or as ensuring an outlook which is not parochial, the appointment by the Prime Minister is not only practically but theoretically sound. A popular appointment by the votes of all the Church people of the diocese would be impossible, or, if possible, would certainly not lead to the best candidate being appointed. The present method, both theoretically and practically, is, I believe, better than any other.

At the present time there is a great demand everywhere for the freedom of the Church; it is thought that the Church of England is in bonds in a way the Free Churches are not. Yet, as a matter of fact, every religious body in the country that holds any property is to a certain extent established. If it is desired that there should be no connection between Church and State, it can only be secured by selling all we have and going forth without purse or scrip to preach the Gospel. So long as the Church holds property that property must be held by legal tenure. Of the validity of its title the State must be the judge; and, consequently, there are many religious bodies in this country which owe their present position to Acts of Parliament. During the eighteenth century many of the old Presbyterian bodies became Unitarian; their chapels were held on trust deeds which were in all cases Trinitarian, and it needed an Act of Parliament to transfer them to the changed community. When the various Methodist bodies wished to unite they had to obtain an Act of Parliament in which their constitution was developed. The Free Church of Scotland thought that they were superior to Parliament and superior to the law; it was a most wholesome discipline to which they were exposed when the House of Lords obliged them to recognize that they must hold their property by Act of Parliament. Nor is it in these islands only that this is so. In America, in almost every state, there are regulations under which different religious bodies hold their property, and in many cases they are not only established but also

endowed by the State, freedom from taxation and so on being by no means unknown. I do not believe that any real advantage would come to the people of this country by the disestablishment, still less by the disendowment, of the Church.

But while our Church must be national and prepared to look at things from a national standpoint, it must also be international. Any aspect of Christianity taught in isolation from other aspects becomes one-sided and ultimately untrue. The national Church should always have its international relations. In two directions we can see how the Church of England has learnt from outside bodies. The first is the revival of what is commonly called Catholicism. While this has to a certain extent an historical basis in the English Church, it was the example of the Roman Church, and still more that of the Eastern Churches, which furthered the development of these ideas in the Church of England; and the fact that the Church of England has assimilated to itself and taken so much from these religious bodies has given to them a far wider influence than they possessed before. When the Church of England assimilated to itself the teaching of another body it naturally and inevitably took such parts as could stand criticism, and therefore produced a Catholicism more in accordance with the thought and mind of the time, purged of its less intelligent elements and capable of influencing a wide circle. The permanent elements of any movement of religious thought can be seen often very much better in the body which learns from it, because it will take to itself what harmonizes with its own ideas and will naturally tend to leave out the more extreme elements.

This is even more remarkably the case with reference to German criticism. I have suggested elsewhere that the work of the German nation in interpreting the records of Christianity and of the Old Testament is one of the most remarkable intellectual achievements of the past century. But, as displayed in its German form, this criticism contained much which was disproportionate,

much which was untrue or incorrect. When another body like the Church of England finds itself up against this state of thought, it may sink down into torpor and refuse to listen to what is said; but if it once begins to listen to the arguments used it will gradually draw to itself all that is most sound in the position which it desires to contest, and the result will be the extraction of what is of permanent value. German criticism could never be permanent; so much of German criticism as the religious minds of the English Church have been able to assimilate may be looked upon as having far deeper sanctions than was supposed. It has been said that the reason so many members of the French Church wished for closer relations with the Church of England was that they desired a reverent criticism; the English Church has given to the world a reverent criticism, taking to itself, criticizing, rejecting as well as assimilating much that has been taught, getting rid of the uncertain and unsound, retaining what were obviously the truer elements.

II

The second characteristic of the Church of England has been its devotion to learning. Let me, to begin with, give you two extracts from an observer from outside—Archbishop Söderblom—which may be, perhaps, held to justify the claim that is made.

"I am not speaking here of a school or tendency, but of a type of piety that appears in different societies, temperaments and combinations. We have used the great name of Erasmus to describe it. But is not England its native home before all others? It was there first in Western Christendom that enthusiasm for the faith of the Church, combined with classical education, burst into full bloom, to bear fruit in the Carolingian Renaissance. It was in England that the first university of Northern Europe was founded. There, at a far later time, the learned Wyclif, in his reform of Church life and doctrine, invoked that evangelic law which Scriptural research had revealed to him, having at the same time the feeling—unknown to Erasmus and his compeers—of a need for anchoring

his poor soul on a bottom deeper than the noblest of human aspirations; that is, in eternal predestination. No idea can possibly enter one's mind of deducing from a single religious type so rich a growth as that exhibited by the Church of England. That Church, while maintaining her continuity, took a definite impress from the Reformation, in her Thirty-nine Articles partly translating the *Confessio Augustana.* Throughout the ages, down to our own time, she is richer in mystics than perhaps any other comparable branch of the Church. But I am nowhere so keenly sensible of the beneficent value of dignified, enlightened piety, wide of heart and open to reforms, as in the Church of England. Nowhere has respect for the first centuries of the Church resounded with a more genuine conviction."[1]

"So impartial a witness as Lecky says: 'Looking at the Church of England from the intellectual side, it is plain how large a proportion of the best intellect of the country is contented, not only to live within it, but to take an active part in its ministrations. There is hardly a branch of serious English literature in which Anglican clergy are not conspicuous. There is no other Church which has shown itself so capable of attracting and retaining the services of men of general learning, criticism and ability.' It has also been remembered that 'the Anglican was the only Church in the sixteenth century which seemed to understand the spiritual significance of the Renaissance. . . . The King James translation of the Bible shows the literary influence of the Renaissance, and the compilation of the Book of Common Prayer is the embodiment of the new thought of religion expressed not in asceticism but in the fulness of life.'"[2]

The practical cause has been the close connection of the Church with the universities. For something like 300 years the Church of England had a monopoly of the two great English universities, and the rich endowments of its colleges were almost confined to the clergy of the Church. It is, unfortunately, true that the Church did not at all times make the best use of the opportunities that were given. Endowments were not entirely endowments of theology, but undoubtedly they had the effect of promoting its study. And the result was to produce a

[1] *Christian Fellowship*, p. 54. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 55.

continued succession of learned men and also to secure that the clergy of the Church of England were distinguished in various branches of learning. That has now been changed. The endowments of the Oxford and Cambridge colleges are almost entirely secularized, and though the tradition remains in both universities, yet already the supply of learned clergy in the Church of England is far less than it was. Moreover, there has been an unfortunate tendency in the last thirty or forty years to despise theological learning. It is quite true that many men who were learned were not good parish priests, that the English Church was deficient perhaps in its popular appeal, that the obligation of bringing home Christianity to the masses of the people has been more fully realized than it was, and that there has been a demand for qualities less profound but perhaps more useful. But it seems to be forgotten that unless there continues a supply of learned clergy ready and able to grapple with the questions of the day, the Church, especially in a time of movement like the present, will inevitably be out of touch with modern thought.

I do not think anyone would deny that the monopoly of the Church in the universities was something which ought to have come to an end. I think we should most of us agree that to confine the fellowships of the colleges to the clergy was something unsuited to the times. At the same time, I cannot but think that the process of secularization has gone and is going too far. Whether as regards the university or the Church, the union of the two was of profound value. A Church without learning soon begins to fail in its work, and a university without spiritual life will be in great danger of becoming narrow and pedantic. The university is a place of training not only of the intellect but also of the character, and religious influence should always be present, but as an influence, not as a restraint. Take an instance. A great Bishop of Exeter founded Exeter College in order to provide his diocese with a continued succession of well-educated clergy, and in order to enable poor scholars to have the

benefit of university life and training. A singularly small proportion of the revenues of such a college are now employed in the training of candidates for orders, and an even smaller proportion in helping those who might be called poor. The English dioceses, and the Diocese of Exeter among them, have now to provide their own funds for training candidates for the ministry. Of recent years various efforts have been made to strengthen the work of the Church in the universities, but unfortunately the efforts have nearly all been sectional, they have not been inaugurated by the Church but by a party in the Church. I am sure, therefore, that if the Church of England is to retain its hold upon the intellectual life of the country, if it is to produce a body of clergy who will appeal to the educated and half-educated laity, it must adopt a policy which will appeal directly to the university. It must be remembered at the present time there are not only the two older universities; modern universities have been founded everywhere; they were founded originally on scientific, secular, and even anti-ecclesiastical lines. As they have developed in strength and power they have lost a great deal of their narrowness; almost all are prepared to welcome theological teaching among them. I am sure that in no way could the funds of the Church be better employed in the immediate future than by creating in these universities strong centres of theological instruction. We recognize that the old idea of exclusiveness is wrong. We recognize that the Church should not control the universities. We recognize that an atmosphere of freedom is that in which theology, like everything else, may be studied and taught best. We should not attempt to claim anything for the Church of England which is not claimed for other religious bodies. But if the universities are to have a spiritual and intellectual life, if the Church is to do its duty, it is the most insistent demand at the present time upon the Church's funds to develop theological teaching and influence in the universities.

A factor in the modern development of the Church of England has been the theological colleges; they were

founded as an adjunct to the universities with a view to giving a theological teaching which was simpler and perhaps more practical. But the result has not, on the whole, been satisfactory. Their staffs have been small, they have been almost entirely connected with a particular type of religious life, and the result has been both the falling off of the intellectual interest of the clergy and the predominance of party motives. I do not say that the theological colleges should cease to perform their functions, but I do feel that they ought to play a very subordinate part in the training of our clergy. If we could have strong centres in the universities they may be powerful adjuncts. If they are looked upon as the right place for the training of the clergy the result will be as harmful as that of the seminary of the Church of Rome.

III

The third characteristic of the Church of England has been the development of religious freedom and toleration. Religious freedom is two-sided: there is first the freedom of every form of religion in the State, there is secondly the freedom of comprehension within the limits of the ecclesiastical organization. I have spoken, in relation to education, to a certain extent of religious freedom and the failure to obtain true freedom. I think that there is a great danger of reaction in these matters. I think the development of anti-clericalism under the cloak of freedom will very likely lead to a revival of clericalism. Already in Italy religious instruction has been made compulsory in the schools, and my feeling is that in other directions liberalism will have been found to have failed because it has been untrue to its own principles. If we did much in England to teach the value of religious freedom and tolerance, I think it will be our duty to defend and strengthen it in the future, and it will be worth great efforts on the part of the Church of England to bring home to the modern mind that the same freedom must prevail with regard to education as with regard to worship.

The second type of religious freedom is that represented

NORWICH PUBLIC LIBRARIES

by comprehension within the religious society. In this relation two influences have made it possible within the Church of England. One is the various tendencies which at different times have prevailed and have developed within it. I have already pointed out three different types of religion, the institutional, the intellectual, the emotional (there are different developments in different societies), and the necessity for the existence of all three types to present religion in its completeness. There has always been a tendency in most religious societies for one of these types to become permanent and then definitely to suppress or drive out the other type; but this has never been possible in the Church of England owing to two causes —the diversity of patronage and the parson's freehold. Neither the will of the people nor the will of the bishop can drive a clergyman out of his living except on adequate grounds which can be tested in a court of law. There are tendencies at the present time which would aim at doing away with this freehold; I am sure the result would be disastrous. It is quite true that there are some disadvantages; it is quite true that it is possible for a clergyman in the Church of England to neglect his duty and remain in his parish. But the number of serious scandals is not great; the vast majority of the clergy at the present day may be of various degrees of capacity and earnestness, but they do their duty to the best of their ability. In this as in other dioceses there are cases where, if it were possible, authority would make a change. But the number of such cases is not serious. Other disadvantages might be prevented by a proper superannuation fund, and if many of the smaller livings could be raised in value more circulation amongst the clergy would be possible. A less cumbrous legal method for dealing with the criminous clerk and a more comprehensive distribution of incomes would help. Some modification of the freehold may be desirable, but to do away with it would make the position of the clergyman dependent on the will of the bishop and the will of the people, and it would in its ultimate result be disastrous. At the present time a

clergyman is free to teach what he pleases within the legal limits of the Church of England. Had this not been the case there would have been no Oxford Movement, and if certain sections of the Church at the present day, and I must add certain bishops, had their will there would be no intelligent study of modern critical questions now. I therefore believe that it is of extreme importance for freedom of thought within the Church of England that the present variety of patronage and the present parson's freehold should be retained.

This freedom has had a remarkable effect. At the present time, as at all times, there are questions of science, of criticism, of philosophy, of psychology with which the truths of religion are intimately concerned. The old methods of representation and statement are in all cases hampered by being delivered through the medium of a philosophy or science which has ceased to be believed. It is necessary that there should be a continuous body of people in the Church ready to approach these questions in a spirit of free enquiry, and I do not think that in that direction at the present time we fail. The Church of England still puts its religious beliefs forward in a way which a cultivated man acquainted with the thought of the day can accept. It is the great service it has rendered to Christendom in the past and a service which it may hope to continue to render.

IV

I come, fourthly, to the mission of the Church of England in relation to the problem of reunion. It has long been recognized that a Church which has affinities in so many different directions with different bodies of Christians is one which is particularly fitted for this work, and it is, I think, directing itself to the task in no unworthy way. I have spoken at length on this subject elsewhere and I will not repeat what I have said there, but what I wish to emphasize is this—that our outlook must be in no way restricted. Even if it might seem more easy to some to ignore the Catholic and link up with the Protestant, or

to others to ignore the Protestant and link up with the Catholic; even if it means that we move more slowly than we hoped to do, even if sometimes our activities in one direction seem to impede our progress in another; yet I believe such a policy would be disastrous.

Now before I conclude let me dwell for one moment on the failure of our Church, the failure of our Church which is also, I think, the failure of the nation. Archbishop Söderblom, whom we have already quoted, suggests where we have failed.

"Speaking in an earlier chapter of the conservative reform programme of Erasmus and his congenial spirits in the Church, we saw that the genius of Anglicanism is certainly more comprehensive, but less creative, than the two other views of Christianity—that of Rome (enriched by the passionate Church ideal of the Spanish monk) and that of Wittenberg. In each of these the problem of Church unity has become acute in a different way."[1]

I think there is amongst us a certain insularity and a want of greatness of conception, and this applies both to our political and intellectual life as well as to our religion. It is in some ways a great thing that we should have created an Empire without meaning to do so. But I cannot help feeling, if, for example, I look at our work in India, that while it has been admirable in many directions, there has been a want of sympathy, a want of creative power, a want of bigness of conception about all we have done. If we were to leave India to-morrow, what great mark of our presence should we leave behind? In the years that have supervened since the war the characteristics of the shopkeeper and acute financier have been too apparent. We have gained a certain prestige, but we have hardly used that prestige as much as we might. There is a want of imagination. A few millions spent in this direction or that would have made a profound difference to many countries of Europe and strengthened our own influence enormously. It is the same in other directions.

[1] *Christian Fellowship*, p. 119.

We have had interesting schools of music and art, but when have we produced anything really great ? We have had a long succession of learned men, but how few creative minds there have been amongst them. Much of our work has been too much that of an amateur. Now I cannot help thinking that in our ecclesiastical and religious conceptions we have been in danger of becoming insular and parochial. We are too much absorbed in the little things of every-day life, and we hardly rise either to the height of constructive genius or creative imagination. Even now we have made a great beginning in the appeal to the Christian Churches of the last Lambeth Conference, but shall we have the courage to carry it out ? There will come a critical moment when we must go forward if we will not go back. We have come very near to union in at least three directions. I do not say the time has come yet when we should attempt to drive home what we have prepared; I quite admit that there must be a period of preparation and of solid work; but I am sure that the time will come when we shall have to have the courage of our convictions and go forward in more than one direction, when we must add to the reasonableness of our convictions and to our comprehensiveness and to our moderation some vigorous creative power which will compel men to finish the task.

CHAPTER X

THE ENGLISH CATHEDRAL: EPISCOPAL VISITATIONS

I PROPOSE to divide the charge that I have to address to you into two parts. To-day we shall speak of the nature and purpose of this visitation. At the end of the day's proceedings the Visitation Court will be adjourned, and I propose on the second occasion to speak of the organization and finance of the cathedral and its place in the life of the Church.

First, then, as to the aim and purpose of the visitation of the cathedral. According to old custom it was usual for the Bishop at the time of his diocesan visitation first to visit the cathedral church and afterwards the diocese. I cannot but think that it is a grave misfortune that this custom has fallen so much into abeyance. The right of visitation in this cathedral is partly dependent upon the ordinary jurisdiction of the Bishop, and partly a special authority which is his under the statutes of the cathedral. According to the ecclesiastical law of this country the Bishop visits his cathedral *iure ordinario*, and the Archbishop *iure metropolitico;* and every spiritual person in the diocese is visitable by the ordinary. This includes the Dean, *de mero iure*, and Chapter and all others who have the Bishop's licence or have been instituted by him.

But besides this general power there is in the case of Gloucester a special power given to the Bishop as visitor under the statutes. I do not think that I need quote them, as they are well known, no doubt, to you. I would only make one observation—that I cannot see that there is anything in the statutes which limits the ordinary power or jurisdiction of the Bishop. In his visitation the Bishop is not concerned merely with those matters specially affecting the cathedral with regard to which regula-

tions are made in the statutes; he also visits members of the cathedral church as spiritual persons. He is concerned not only as to their manner of life, but as to their orthodoxy, and it might be his duty to enquire either whether the services were carried out in accordance with the regulations of the Church of England, or whether in the sermons which were preached in the cathedral there was any heresy or unsound doctrine. I have no doubt that the Bishop is entitled to visit both by right of his ordinary episcopal jurisdiction and also under the statutes.

Although of recent years visitations of the cathedral have fallen into abeyance, yet we have records that at one time they were common, and it seems probable that they were carried out regularly every three years in accordance with the statutes. Owing to the valuable researches into the history of the diocese which have been carried on with such enthusiasm by Mr. Hockaday, I am able to give some account of these visitations.

We have records of Bishop Wakeman's visitations in 1542-1548. The most noteworthy point seems to me the questions that were asked as to whether the Dean and other Prebendaries " gave out of their own proper charges to one clerk at least studying in some University a competent exhibition." The Dean asserts that it has been done so regularly up to the present. Mr. Henry Willis, Canon, says that neither the Dean nor any other Canon affords any sufficient exhibition. Mr. Richard Monnslowe, Canon, swore that he affords an exhibition to one Walter Jones, a student at Oxford in New Inn Hall. In 1553 the Dean and Chapter were cited by Bishop Hooper; they refused to appear, were declared contumacious and suspended from office. In 1554-1558 there were visitations by Bishop Brooks; in 1561 a Metropolitical Visitation by Archbishop Parker. In 1565 Bishop Cheyney visited; in 1576 and 1580 Archbishop Grindal visited. In 1594 and 1597 Bishop Bullingham visited. In 1594 it was stated that the statutes had never received the King's Great Seal of England, and the Dean and Chapter

claimed to be exempt from obeying them. The Bishop, however, issued decrees and ordinances to regulate the affairs of the Chapter.

In 1599 and in 1602 Bishop Goldsborough visited; in 1605 Bishop Ravis. On this occasion the Dean refused: "the worshipful Griffin Lewes, Dean of the Cathedral Church, did not appear and was pronounced contumacious by the Bishop." Later he appeared before the Vicar-General and asserted that if the Bishop has come with the intention of visiting armed with the royal authority he is ready to offer all obedience, but in case he visits of his own episcopal right and authority, then he refuses to be visited by that authority. Finally, however, the Dean and other Prebendaries deliberately submitted themselves to the visitation of the said Lord Bishop and to his jurisdiction as ordinary. The Dean stated that if he be bound by the foundation of the Church he will willingly submit himself to the visitation of the Lord Bishop of Gloucester, and will observe the statutes of the Church "so far as they are not repugnant to the word of God, the laws of the land, or the said foundation of the Church." In 1607 Bishop Parry visited, and again in 1610; in 1609 Archbishop Bancroft, and in 1612 Archbishop Abbot, during a vacancy of the See. In 1613, 1616, 1619, 1622 Bishop Smith visited. Of his later visitations there is no record. In 1628 Bishop Goodman visited. There was also a visitation by Archbishop Laud in 1635, but of that no record seems to have been preserved in the Registry.

The next visitations of which we have any record are in 1661, 1663, 1665 by Bishop Nicholson, who in 1669 also visited the Hospital of St. Bartholomew. The chief point of historical interest seems to be the evidence that during the disturbed times of the Commonwealth there had been much encroachment on the property of the Dean and Chapter. "Divers gardens have been taken in from the Church yards and the open passage out of the upper Church yard into the Common Orchard is now stopped up." "There has also been the Commonway to my

Lord Bishop's Orchard which has been taken in and the Commonway belonging to the Church in the Upper Orchard. Mr. Isaac Williams has encroached and Mr. William Lamb has built a house upon the waste." Many more encroachments are recorded. Also we are informed that "John Evans hath and doth sell Bear and Cyder and he keeps hoges and hennes which never used to be done and he hath a backe dore. Mr. Lambert has erected a small place for the use of his trade and burning of pipes against the cloisterwall in the common orchard. And the inhabitants living about the farmery have been throwing dung to the annoyance of those that pass by: and there is a dung miskine lying in the Millerds Grenne." No doubt during this period there was much destruction of old places and much encroachment on the rights of the Dean and Chapter and the clergy.

In 1669 we find objections made by the Dean and Chapter to the statutes. The statutes, it is asserted:

"fitted to those dayes, are not accommodate to ours, there being many of them which must not bee done, as Superstitious and against the Present Doctrine and Discipline of the Church; And others which need not bee done, as those concerning a Common Table with Habits and other Ceremonies, now not required or allowed. And others there are which cannot bee done; as, Residence of the Deane all the yeare, excepting an 100 dayes; and of the Canons all the yeare excepting 80 dayes and some other dispensed times upon particular occasions which would destroy the profits of other Dignities and Benefices, or much diminish them, whereas their Cathedrall Dignities are intended for Encreases of their Maintenances.

"A Chapter to be kept every fifteene dayes, which cannot bee unless the Deane and Canons were Commorant on the place, or so neare it as they might come to it without great trouble and charge, which great distances suffer not, or which are found of superfluous use and Charge, and not necessary but prejudiciall to bee done, as the haveing of a Receptor besides the Treasurer, though an office at first instituted and perticulerly directed how to bee done.

"The Number of Six Petty Canons and Six Lay Clerks with a Deacon and Sub-deacon: which the Church in these

Dearnesse of Times, is not able to maintaine in the Proportion which now is given to three, being so much as was allowed to Six, which would bee too little any wayes to live upon. The meeting of the Bayliffs etc. in the outward Aerarie. The Sacrists Office hath of long been neglected though perticulerly appointed and prescribed.

" That upon these and the like Considerations Diverse things in the Statutes have beene omitted and altered: Viz. 1. A Virger distinctly made, and no Porter used for that purpose in all the memory of our Bookes and Ministers, to avoyd inconveniences which by the 2 Virgae-bajuli-porters were or might be occasioned.

" 2. For what concerns Petticanons and Quiristers The Statutes doe not limitt us, and wee desire not to bee limited.

" 3. What is ordered about The Deane and Canons preaching, The Offertorie and Communion, Reading the Litanie by 2 Petticanons Marriages by Precentor in the Cathedrall Burialls, etc., Vacating unnecessary offices of Cook, Butler, etc., as they shall fall void. Perticulerly and lately the Subcoquus by Mr. Taylor of ye Quire of Windsor, dyeing, the place is not filled, though the Deane might have done it.

" 4. The Habits appointed by Statute, were not observed by any Deane or Chapter wee know of, nor soe appointed by anie Bishop before our Times, though they were persons of great prudence and pietie, and such as willfully would not violate any plaine Statute to which they were obliged.

" That Orders made by Deans and Chapters are by their appointment to be observed, and so need not againe to bee ordered: neither Deane Laud's nor any others.

" That the Deanes and Canons in their Oath at their Installations doe sweare to keep the Statutes in accordance with the customs of the Church.

" Wee desire no new things may bee imposed upon us, such as were not by any Bishops your predecessors, in or out of their Visitations. Wee desire that if any of the Quire or inferior officers and Servants of the Church shall sett aside the Government of the Church under which they are to live, and make any Addresses to the Bishop by His Servants or otherwaies as some have done, they may bee remanded to the Dean and Chapter, that their disobediences may not be encouraged, nor they in them.

" Wee desire that all things by us offered and done may

bee favourably interpreted, that no Intrenchment may bee upon the power of the Deane (as Distinct from the Bishop's) as wee shall be carefull not to usurp upon the Bishops power.

"That it bee considered, that wee are by Oath obliged to keep the Customs of the Church, as in present use, and the Statutes no further than they agree with such Customes.

"Wee desire that the Bishops Orders at his Visitation may not be Registered in our Chapter Booke, there being no Example of any such Registring, save that of Arch Bishop Laud's which was not by Episcopall but Metropoliticall Visitation. The rather, because Diverse particulars are of inferior Consideration, below (as wee think) the Visitors Wisdome to committ them to Record, and the Deane and Chapters to see them committed. Wee desire it may bee considered, That as neither Bishop nor Arch Bishop, have power to make any new Statutes or dispense with them that doe, The Deane and Canons are forbid to receive them, sub poena Perjurii and Amotionis perpetuae ab Ecclesia nostra; The King onely haveing full Power and Authority reserved to Him, to alter the Statutes, or make new.

"And wee desire it may be well weighed, whether in the Visitation Articles, there may not be found some such Alterations of Statutes.

"Lastly wee desire that for prevention of all further contentions and differences, the Sub-Deane may sitt in the Seate over against the Deane's, which is the second Seate in Dignitie and by Statute appointed to the Subdeane as next to the Deane and wherein hee hath used to bee seated Though the Arch-Deacon pro hac vice onely bee installed in it."

"WILLIAM BROUGH,
"*Dean of Gloucester.*

"*December* 11, 1669."

We have visitations by Bishop Pritchett in 1673, 1676, 1679. The next visitation is in 1707 by Richard Parsons, Chancellor, on behalf of Bishop Fowler. At that visitation it was pleaded that owing to the long disuse of visitations they asked favourable interpretation be put upon their actions, as the statutes have not been observed by their predecessors according to the letter and strictness,

but according to equity only. In 1730 we have an interesting note in Bishop Martin Benson's account book: "At the Visitation of the Cathedral begun 13th July, 1739, and ended 26th June, 1740, received in lieu of an entertainment £4." In 1751 we find Dean Newcome suspended from his office by Bishop Benson for disobedience to the statutes. There is no record of the actual visitations of 1740 and 1742, and the last visitation appears to have been held in 1784, of which again there is no record.

Many interesting points rise out of this record. The point that I wish particularly to draw attention to is the difficulty that has been felt with regard to the statutes. It is pointed out that they are not observed according to the letter, but that a custom has grown up which supersedes the statutes. It is obvious, if we turn to the more strict language which is used by Henry VIII., that it was never intended that anything of this sort should have been allowed, that if necessary proper alterations should have been made in the statutes from time to time, by royal authority. This appears to have been done in 1750, 1784, and 1785, when new statutes with regard to residence received the approval of the Crown. Then by the Cathedral Act of 1840 further regulations were made which clearly modified the statutes. Authority was given to the Dean and Chapter, or to the Visitor if the Dean and Chapter did not act, to alter the statutes so as to make them consistent with the constitution and duties of the Chapters as altered under the authority of this Act. But nothing was done. Then finally the Commission of 1883 drafted a new series of statutes, which seem to have preserved all that was valuable in the old and were adapted to the present day. It seems to me most unfortunate that no attempt has been made to bring the statutes into agreement with the rules by which the cathedral church is governed and to adapt them to the conditions of the present day.

It is for reasons like these that it is to be regretted that the habit of visiting the cathedral church has fallen

into abeyance. But there is another strong reason why I feel that it is wise that the government and position of our cathedrals should be carefully weighed and examined at the present time. It must be known to all members of the Dean and Chapter that much criticism has been expended within recent years on the management and constitution of our cathedrals. There are some ardent reformers who are most anxious to abolish Deans. They think a certain amount of money would be saved, and that perhaps the office of Dean could be combined with that of Bishop. I feel it desirable to remind you of these proposals and draw your attention to them, but I venture to say even at this stage of our proceedings that I have no sympathy with any such suggestions. The duties of a Dean and a Bishop are clearly quite different, and it is impossible for a Bishop to do his work in the diocese properly if he is also concerned in the direct management of the cathedral church.

Another proposal that is made is for the curtailing of the number of Canons in the cathedrals. The number was very considerably reduced in the year 1850, when, for example, two canonries were suppressed in Gloucester. It appears as if these reformers thought that a cathedral church was something like a parish church, that the Canons were to be looked upon as a sort of curates. It is suggested that with two, or at the outside three, Canons, it would be quite possible for the services to be carried on, and the idea that a Canon has any other duty except to attend services in the church does not seem to have crossed the minds of these reformers. Moreover, there seems to prevail in certain quarters an idea that the only thing necessary is to save money, and that the Church of England should be managed as cheaply as possible.

The above suggestions are unauthorized proposals and will not, I think, mature; but there is one more reason why I should feel that the visitation of a cathedral is important, and would enjoin the members of the cathedral body to consider carefully in what way they may best perform the functions with which they are entrusted, and

what changes they would desire to promote in regard to the constitution of the cathedral church. It is well known that an enquiry has been made into the property and finances of the Church of England, and it is also well known to you that the affairs of the cathedrals have been carefully considered by that body. I had hoped that the report would have been published before this, and that at this stage in my visitation I could have spoken to you openly about it. That, I am afraid, is not possible: I could not put before you any of the proposals made without a breach of confidence. But it will appear in a short time, and I would enjoin upon the Dean and Chapter the importance of considering carefully the proposals that are therein made, and of considering whether an opportunity will not be presented for making such reforms and changes as are desirable.

In conclusion, may I say something about the spirit and purpose with which I think that we all approach this visitation. The cathedral in its origin was, in a particular way, the Bishop's church. As the work of the Bishop developed and the opportunities that he had for personally superintending the services of the Church diminished, this portion of his work was gradually delegated to the Deans and Chapters and other bodies to whom the care of the cathedral was entrusted; and according to a common historical process these bodies have gradually attained a position and privileges of their own; but that has not severed the Bishop from the cathedral or diminished his duties and responsibilities, and at the time of the visitation those duties are imposed upon him to a full extent. I do not think there is any difference in conception or opinion amongst any of us as to our desires with regard to the cathedral. We recognize its unique architectural beauty and its historical interest; we recognize fully our duty to preserve it as part of the history of the diocese and of the country, but we recognize even still more its spiritual significance, and that the cathedral is not merely a place to which people should come for the sake of seeing the buildings, but that it is in a particular

way a place of worship. At the present time this latter conception and the demand for linking the cathedrals more closely with the religious life of the country is, I think, developing. Throughout this diocese there is great affection for the cathedral; there is a great desire to be closely associated with it; there is a great desire on the part of many of finding it a place not merely to visit but a place to worship in and a place to pray in. I do not doubt that this desire of the diocese is one to which everyone connected with the cathedral wishes to respond. The changes which are contemplated will make it easier for these desires to be carried out, and it is with this object that we can all work together. We wish even more completely than has been possible in the past to make the cathedral church a spiritual centre of the work of the diocese.

CHAPTER XI

THE ENGLISH CATHEDRAL: CATHEDRAL REFORM

I MUST first of all express my thanks to the Dean and Chapter for the careful manner in which they have answered the interrogatories that I addressed to them. As to the matter of the answers I shall have some criticism to make shortly, but I have been much impressed by the accuracy with which the answers have been made.

I should also like to express the pleasure that is afforded me by the fact that everything connected with the cathedral also appears to be done with care and efficiency. Again, there will be questions of policy on which I may have to express a difference of opinion; and if I were to attempt to ask whether the statutes have been literally obeyed, I might again have to express criticism. But as regards the conscientious performance of duty there seems to be no criticism that I need make. The buildings are cared for. The musical rendering of the services is reverent and beautiful. The Dean and Canons alike fulfil all the obligations of residence. The services of the Church are carried on with regularity and order. More particularly I have been impressed by the evidence that has come to me of the way in which the Dean and Canons fulfil their duties as preachers throughout the diocese. It is of great importance at the present time that the Church of England should recognize that the work performed by members of a Cathedral body is of real value. Besides keeping up the services of the cathedral, it is the duty of the Canons, imposed upon them by the canons ecclesiastical, to preach in churches in the diocese. It is their duty to devote themselves to the promotion of learning, and although it is not a legal obligation it seems to me

that it is a moral obligation to help in the work of the diocese. Under all those headings the Canons of this cathedral make, so far as I can judge, an adequate contribution to the work of the Church, which, in this diocese, would be much less efficient if there were not this assistance.

It will be convenient, I think, if I first begin with criticism. There are three points upon which an opinion has been expressed by the Dean and Chapter with which I cannot agree. The first is the relation of the Bishop to the cathedral; the second, the position of the Honorary Canons; and the third, the publicity of the Visitation Court.

On the first point, the relation of the Bishop to the cathedral, the opinions expressed are contained in the answers to the Interrogatories and also in the *Notes on the Statutes of the New Foundations*—a paper presented by the Deans of Winchester and Gloucester to the Commission of Property and Finance of the Church and published in the appendices to their report. The relation of the Bishop to his cathedral depends partly upon the general law of the Church, partly on the Charter of Foundation of the Bishopric. In the Charter it is stated:

"Wherefore, considering that the site of the said late Monastery of St. Peter of Gloucester, in which many famous monuments of our renowned ancestors, Kings of England, are erected, is a very fit and proper place for erecting, instituting, and establishing an Episcopal See, and an Episcopal Church, of one Bishop, one Dean, a Presbyter, and six Prebendaries Presbyters, for the service of Almighty God for ever: We have decreed, and by these presents we do decree the site of the said Monastery of St. Peter in Gloucester, and the place and Church thereof, to be an Episcopal See, and to be created, erected, and established a Cathedral Church."

Then again it is stated:

"And moreover, and by these presents We do Ordain that the said Cathedral Church from henceforth forward for ever shall be the Cathedral Church and See Episcopal of the said John Bishop of Gloucester, and of his Successors Bishops of Gloucester; and the said Cathedral Church We

do by these presents adorn with the Honours, Dignities, and Ensigns of an Episcopal See."

And then again:

"And moreover, We Will, and by these presents do Ordain, that the aforesaid John and his Successors Bishops of Gloucester aforesaid, may, can, and ought to exercise, perform, and use all and all manner of jurisdiction, power, and authority, as well ordinary as extraordinary, within the Cathedral Church of Gloucester and Diocese aforesaid, from this time forth and for ever, in as ample manner and form as the Bishop of Worcester by our laws might, could, or ought to exercise, perform, and use."

And then in appointing the Dean it is stated:

"That he the said Dean and every of his successors to be by us named, have, and possess the first place of dignity in the said Cathedral Church next to the said Bishop."

Clearly the Charter means that the cathedral church shall be the church of the Bishop, and that he shall have full and complete episcopal authority both ordinary and extraordinary in the cathedral church. In addition to that, the statutes constitute the Bishop the Visitor of the cathedral.

It is, however, maintained in the answer of the Dean and Chapter that the meaning of the terms "full jurisdiction, power, and authority, ordinary and episcopal," is expounded in the statutes: and in the *Notes on the Statutes*, published by the Commission on Property and Finance, it is stated: "In the New Foundation Cathedrals, whatever the Charter allowed to him, the Statutes, which are the vital matter, defined and limited." It seems to me that this view of the relation of the statutes to the Charter is incorrect. It is the Charter that regulates the relation of the Bishop to the cathedral. The statutes do not deal with that question at all; they are concerned simply with the powers of the Dean and Chapter. They regulate the method by which the Dean and Chapter appointed in the Charter are to carry out their duties and functions. So far from limiting the power of the Bishop,

the statutes of the cathedral increase it, for they give him, in addition to his ordinary visitatorial power, which he can exercise as Bishop, the further position of being Visitor under the statutes. The statutes do not deal with the position of the Bishop, they assume it. They are addressed not to the Bishop but to the Dean and Canons, and in various places in them they presuppose the ordinary action of the Bishop. I am quite clear in my own mind of this interpretation. I have had legal advice on the subject, and I am glad also to find that the same opinion was formed by Bishop Forrest Browne in his visitation of the Cathedral of Bristol. In his final charge he states:

"The statutes have nothing to do with the pre-existing powers of the Bishop. They are a body of regulations for the governance of the Chapter and the Cathedral Church, none of the regulations touching the powers of the Bishop. They are addressed to the Dean and Chapter, not to the Bishop. The Bishop's functions are assumed by them as in full action, as when in Chapter XI. the presentation of the Dean to the Bishop by the Crown, and the institution of the Dean by the Bishop, are mentioned incidentally, and similarly in Chapter X. in regard to the appointment of a Canon by the Crown. The Bishop's powers are entirely independent of the statutes."

That the attempt to limit the Bishop's powers by those which are given him under the statutes is not correct may be shown by one or two points.

In the first place, as regards his powers as a visitor. The Bishop, when he visits his cathedral, is bound to enquire into all such questions as the orthodoxy of the teaching and the fulfilment of the legal obligations in regard to public worship. He would further be entitled to order the removal of any ornaments which were illegal in their character. None of these matters are touched upon in the statutes, which are purely domestic in their character. Further than that, it is recognized, even by the Dean and Chapter, that the Bishop has rights in the cathedral although they would consider them somewhat limited.

But none of these are secured by the statutes, they were already in existence and remain so notwithstanding them. I think that this view of the position of the statutes of the cathedrals vitiates the whole of the reasoning in the paper published in the appendices to the Commission of Property and Finance Report, and in the answers of the interrogatories of the Dean and Chapter.

Two deductions have been made from this to which I must shortly refer, although they are not contained in the answers of the Dean and Chapter. The one is the statement that in Bristol, Chester, Gloucester, Rochester, the Bishop has no power to preach or celebrate; the second, the statement that the Dean is Ordinary. Both these statements are contained in the paper I have referred to, but they are given without any argument or authority in their support.

In dealing with these points, the first thing we have to remember is that the cathedral is the Bishop's church, that it is that by tradition and custom, and that it is implied that it is that in the Charter of Foundation. That makes it pre-eminently the church in which the Bishop should officiate. In the large dioceses of Northern Europe, the wide area over which the Bishop held jurisdiction necessarily compelled him to delegate much of his authority in relation to the cathedral church to the Dean or other subordinate official, and this was further made necessary by the fact that Bishops were so much employed on affairs of State which took them away from their dioceses. But although this naturally gave a definite and established position to the Dean and Canons of the cathedrals, it did not take away the potentiality of the Bishop's action. It seems to me that there is necessarily inherent in the Bishop's office a right to preach and to celebrate in his own cathedral, and that that is a right which would not suffer from desuetude.

Then, secondly, the cathedral is the parish church of the whole diocese. This position is recognized by the Courts, which have decided that attendance at cathedral worship is equivalent to attendance at the particular

parish church of the parish to which the worshipper belongs. It is recognized that the Bishop can in a parish church in his diocese, if he thinks fit, minister instead of the parish priest. There is nothing, it seems to me, to differentiate the right to so minister from the right to minister in the cathedral church, except so far as that right is expressly or by implication taken away, as it is, for example, in the Gloucester Statute 12. The Bishop could not claim in Gloucester Cathedral to preach on Easter Day or Christmas Day.

Thirdly, stress is laid on the word " gubernare " applied to the authority of the Dean. That gives him authority over the Canons and other minor officials of the cathedral. It puts him in the proper position of the governor of the cathedral. It is his duty to regulate the services of the cathedral, as it is the duty of the parish priest to regulate the services of his church, but it does not give him any authority over the Bishop, who is specifically stated to have all ordinary episcopal authority in the cathedral.

On these grounds I hold that the Bishop has, as inherent in his episcopal office, the right to preach and celebrate in his cathedral; and I may mention that as regards the latter point the right has been fully exercised for at least fifty years past—that is to say, as far back as we know anything on the subject.

The second point upon which difference of opinion has occurred is with regard to the summoning of the Honorary Canons to the Visitation Court. The reasons that have been alleged against it are, that the Honorary Canons should not be admitted of right into the Chapter House, and that the Dean and Canons have sworn to obey the statutes of the cathedral. Neither of those arguments have convinced me. They both seem to imply a certain misunderstanding. The position is not that the Honorary Canons have right of entrance into the Chapter House, but that the Bishop, in his position as visitor, has the right to set up his Visitation Court in the Chapter House, and to that Visitation Court he summons all those over whom he exercises jurisdiction. He exercises juris-

NORWICH PUBLIC LIBRARIES

diction over all those to whom he has given his licence or whom he has instituted, and also over those laymen over whom particular authority is given to him by the statutes. All the Honorary Canons are duly instituted and have sworn canonical authority to the Bishop, and are therefore liable to be summoned to his visitation. Nor is there in this anything contrary to the statutes. The position of the Honorary Canons is settled by Act of Parliament, and that Act, like other Acts of Parliament, modifies or amends the statutes in so far as it applies to them. By that Act the Honorary Canons are made members of the Cathedral body. They are given precedence directly after the Canons. Nor is this an entirely empty distinction. It is recognized by custom that if a Canon is unable to fulfil his residence it is a proper and right thing for him to ask an Honorary Canon to take his place. It is therefore proper that the Bishop should enquire into the conduct of the Honorary Canons who are subject to his jurisdiction as much as those of other persons who have been instituted by him or his predecessors.

The third point is the question of the publicity of the Visitation Court. On the last occasion a reporter was asked to withdraw at the direction of the Dean. That again seemed to me to be a misunderstanding of the whole position. The Dean was present in a Court to which he had been summoned. He had no authority to remove the reporter. Had he desired that the reporter should be removed, he might have made some protest to the Bishop. I did not at the time interfere, as I did not want to cause any disturbance or unnecessary difference of opinion, but I feel bound to allude to the matter now. I do not know any grounds, either in the statutes or in the ordinary law of the country, by which the Dean and Chapter can claim that the visitation should be held in private. As far as I am aware, a reporter was present both at the visitation of the Bishop of Exeter and at the visitation of the Bishop of Bristol when they visited their cathedrals. Nor do I think, on grounds of policy, that it is in any way wise for

the Dean and Chapter to shun publicity. There is nothing, either in the manner of their performance of their duties or of their fulfilment of financial obligations, which will not bear, so far as I can see, the fullest scrutiny. At the present time, when there is so much criticism directed against various institutions, the wisest thing is to ask for and to seek the fullest publicity when any examination takes place. I should hope that in the future the statutes of the cathedral will demand the publication of the accounts of the Dean and Chapter, as of any other similar body. All the Oxford Colleges now are compelled by law to publish their audited accounts, and it will be most desirable that the same directions should be given to the Cathedral bodies in the future. It will do much to strengthen their position and to take away the criticisms which have been levelled against them.

I have considered carefully what it is my duty to do on these points upon which differences of opinion have existed. The Bishop of Bristol, when he visited his cathedral, made a decree on certain points. I do not feel that at present it would be desirable that I should do so, for reasons which will become apparent in the course of my charge. At present the custom prevails of the Canon in residence with great courtesy asking the Bishop if he would preach on some Sunday during his residence, and the custom also prevails of the Bishop celebrating on giving due notice to the Canon in residence. I am quite content at present to adhere to the prevailing custom and leave the position of the Bishop with regard to his cathedral to be defined by subsequent legislation. If such subsequent legislation were not to take place, it would be my duty to reconsider the whole question.

To turn to wider subjects, let me now speak of the Commission on Property and Finance, so far as it concerns the cathedral churches of this country—a Commission of which I had the honour to be a member. In the course of our investigations certain points became apparent. In the first place, all or almost all the cathedrals are governed by statutes which are in various degrees

obsolete. Certainly Gloucester is no exception in that respect. It is stated in your reply that "the statutes are observed in accordance with the terms of our oath, save in so far as the provisions have in certain cases been affected by later legislation, or owing to change of conditions are impossible."

I hardly think that that statement really covers the case.

Further, it is stated that "the statutes have been considerably modified; in part by Episcopal or Metropolitical Visitation and in part by legislation as contemplated in Statute 37." Statute 37 would certainly admit alteration by legislation, but it seems to me that however desirable it may have been, modification by Episcopal or Metropolitical Visitation is entirely contrary to the statutes, which state, "we utterly forbid the visitor, and the interpreter of our statutes, and all other men, of what dignity or authority they shall be, to make any new statutes, or to dispense with any of the old."

There are many things that I might enumerate in which the statutes are not obeyed and in which they might be—for example, holding fortnightly Chapters—but I do not in the least wish to press this matter. It is sufficient that the statutes are obsolete and that it is most desirable that both for this and other cathedrals powers should be definitely given to make new statutes adapted to the times.

The second point that became apparent to us was that as regards most cathedrals their incomes were inadequate for the work that they had to do. The Dean is seldom adequately paid. He has a house to live in which it is most expensive to keep up. In some of the cathedrals his net emolument is only £300 to £400, and the same is the case with regard to the Canons. There is not enough money really for the upkeep of the services of the cathedral, and—a fact as important as any—there is not enough for the material repairs of the fabric. It was represented to us, and we agreed with what was put before us, that in the case of many cathedrals the fact that the continuous repairs which ought to go on from year to year had not

been sufficiently carried out was the cause why it was suddenly necessary to collect large sums for preserving the cathedrals. This state of affairs is really largely owing to the action of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners. In accordance with their original appointment, they took over the estates of the Deans and Chapters. The object was that they might bring to an end the uneconomic system of land tenure or beneficial leases which at that time prevailed. This has been done in the case of every cathedral except Hereford, which, for some reason or other, still manages its affairs on the same principles that prevailed in the Middle Ages. They then re-endowed the cathedrals with estates which were supposed to bring in a sufficient amount to enable them to keep up reduced establishments which had been settled for them. The Ecclesiastical Commissioners retained the remainder of the estates, but while the estates which were given over to the cathedrals were for the most part agricultural land or tithes, which rapidly decreased in value, the more lucrative estates in the towns were reserved for themselves by the Ecclesiastical Commissioners. It was represented to us, in the case certainly of one cathedral, that they found in their own old books records of estates which had belonged to the cathedral and which were now increasing in value. It seemed to us quite clear that it was not desirable, except possibly in one or two cases, that the cathedrals should continue to receive their income from tithes or landed estates. While in some cases these were well administered, it did not seem to us that that had always been the case. It will be much better for the Deans and Canons that they should have fixed incomes paid to them regularly by the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, and that they should be granted an adequate sum for the upkeep of the cathedral and its services, and the repair of its fabric.

I much hope that the National Assembly will see their way to the appointment of such a Statutory Commission as is proposed. It is not desired that the statutes of all cathedrals should be made uniform, but it is desired that

a considerably greater uniformity should be introduced. It will be necessary, of course, to settle with such a Commission what shall be the number and the payment of the members of the Chapter and the amount which shall be granted for the upkeep of the cathedral. It is, I think, certainly intended that the grants from the Ecclesiastical Commissioners should exceed the amount which is at present received in the case of many of the cathedrals. It has been calculated that about £50,000 a year would be necessary to bring the incomes of the cathedrals up to the amount that was intended when the present reorganization was introduced by the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, and that, at any rate, should be forthcoming. The duty will then lie with the Dean and Chapter, with the approval of the Visitor, to prepare draft statutes for such a Commission.

In order to consider the lines that such statutes should follow, let us consider the position that the cathedral should occupy at the present time in the religious life of the country and of the diocese. The value and usefulness of cathedrals has been a growing tradition. Part of the revival of religious life in this country has connected itself with a fuller appreciation of the dignity and beauty of Gothic architecture, and when we think of the cathedrals our first thought is of the buildings themselves. During the last hundred years very large sums of money, partly from voluntary subscriptions, have been expended in the preservation and restoration of the cathedrals, sometimes wisely, sometimes not so wisely. At any rate we inherit buildings which have been largely adapted to the uses of the present day. But though much has been done much still remains to be done.

The second point that we associate with the cathedrals is the tradition of Church music that they have handed on. The musical services of our cathedrals are renowned throughout Europe and America; many great composers have held the office of organist in a cathedral. Probably the high standard of English music is largely owing to this influence. In this tradition Gloucester has played

a worthy part, and our musical services have attained a high standard of excellence, but at the present time the amount available, either for the payment of the organist or for the upkeep of the choir, is not really sufficient.

Thirdly, our cathedrals have for many years past been associated with the life of the county and of the diocese by being made the seat from time to time of services and ceremonies of a wide national and religious import. Again, I notice that in some cases the holding of such services has been rendered difficult by the cost of carrying them out. Quite rightly, in the present state of the cathedral finances, it is laid down that any expenses of special services are defrayed by the body applying for the service according to a fixed scale of fees; although this does not apply to purely diocesan services and a few special cases. In the present state of the finances of the cathedral this is inevitable, but I cannot but note that from the other side it has been represented to me that various bodies have been precluded from holding their services in the cathedral by the large amount that they would have to pay in fees. I think in some cases, at any rate, this has been a misfortune, and I should hope that in the future the cathedral might be made more useful on wider lines.

These represent what the cathedrals have meant until recently, but I notice that in this, as in other directions, there is a considerable change coming over the country. There is a far wider circle of religious people interested in the cathedral and the cathedral services. It is perhaps characteristic of the age, partly wholesome, partly unwholesome, that whereas regular attendance at church, certainly the old-fashioned attendance at church, is dying out, anything that arouses special interest in connection with religion exercises a wider appeal. The greater facilities for moving about in the country have produced this, and I often notice when I hold a special service in any place the number of motors and often motor charabancs which have been used to bring people from neighbouring villages. Then, again, a wider body of persons

are anxious to associate the cathedral more directly and definitely with the religious life of the people. They wish our cathedrals not to be merely a place of occasional services and of antiquarian interest, but a place constantly associated with religious life. It is reasons like these which led to a recent vote in the Diocesan Conference suggesting to the Dean and Chapter the desirability of throwing open the whole body of the cathedral, not only to visitors, but also for private prayer, and it has also created the desire that all the chapels in the cathedral should be fitted up and used for public worship. I remember that when I had a parish in Hertfordshire I caused some astonishment by writing to the Rector of St. Albans, who was then in charge of St. Albans Abbey, asking that when I took one of my Communicant Guilds to visit the Abbey we might have the use of a chapel to say our office. This unusual request was granted. I do not know that it has yet become a precedent, but I am sure that it would be a very great gain if, when bodies of persons of different parishes come to Gloucester to visit the cathedral, leave was given to them to have their own service in some chapel; and I am sure that the proposal that the different chapels of the cathedral should be associated closely with the religious and secular life of the diocese would have a wide appeal at the present time.

Of course all this demands more money. I would venture to suggest that in this connection there should be some association started of friends of the cathedral, or something of that sort, a body of persons who would be prepared to give some subscription annually to keep up the cathedral services and for the preservation of the fabric, in addition to the larger sums which will, I hope, be received from the Ecclesiastical Commissioners.

I have in my mind, then, in the suggestions that I am going to put before you the development of the cathedral in many directions as the centre of the religious life of the diocese. In this connection I would particularly refer you to the able paper by the late Dr. Rashdall, Dean of Carlisle, in which he discussed the utility of Deans and

Chapters and made suggestions for reform. It is published on page 240 in the appendix to the *Report of the Commission on Property and Finance.*

In making new statutes, the first point would be the relation of the Dean and Chapter to the Bishop, and I would refer you to the suggestions of Dr. Rashdall:

"The Bishop should certainly be given the right to officiate and to preach at all times, with reasonable notice; and it might perhaps be provided that he should have the power of using the cathedral at any time he pleases for any extraordinary service in which he personally takes part. This, of course, would not carry with it the right to require the attendance of the choir at unusual times without the consent of the Dean or of the Dean and Chapter, or to impose any expense upon the Cathedral body."

Similarly in the memorandum of the Deans of Wells, of Lichfield, and of Salisbury, it is suggested:

"Although we have no experience of any friction in such matters, we desire to express our view that the Bishop of the diocese should have the right of preaching, ordaining or confirming in his cathedral church whenever he may desire to do so, provided that he gives due notice of his intention."

We now come to the question of the relations of the Dean and Chapter and the difficult question of the government of cathedrals. I should like to begin by saying that I should not endorse the proposals which have been made for the abolition of Deans or for the abolition or the serious reduction in number of Canons. On both these points I would refer you to Dr. Rashdall's paper. I may say that in the early meetings of our Commission on Property and Finance, the question of reduction in number of Canons was brought forward several times, but I notice that it has gradually dropped out and that no mention was made of it at the end. We had quite sufficient evidence, particularly from those dioceses in which there is no proper Dean and Chapter, of the need of diocesan clergy and of the gap which is felt in dioceses

which are without them. At Wakefield, for example, great efforts have been made to build up a Cathedral body.

A more difficult question arises on the government of the cathedral. It has been pointed out that Deans and Chapters are a heterogeneous collection of persons, often without much unity of purpose and aim, and it is said that they are hardly the right body to organize the services of a great church; that what is required is single action and control. So at Wakefield the newly appointed Canons are to be connected particularly with diocesan work, while the whole control of the cathedral services is to be left in the hands of one man, who is, I think, designated as the Warden. I am not certain that I agree with this proposal, and I am a little inclined to adhere to the traditional government by Deans and Chapters. I should not allow the Dean to be an autocrat, but I should certainly suggest that he should have a considerable amount of personal control. May I again quote Dr. Rashdall:

"Differences of opinion will naturally arise as to how much power should be entrusted to the Dean. I should myself have no wish to make him an autocrat; but I should plead that it would be desirable that he should have complete power over the arrangement of services, as he has now under the statutes of some cathedrals. The arrangement of the services—especially of extraordinary services—involves a large number of small points on which a rapid decision is required. . . . In all cases, of course, the power of the Dean will be limited by the necessity of going to the Chapter for any expenditure of money, or any interference with the fabric or ornaments of the church such as would require a faculty in the case of a parish church."

It has often been proposed, as, for example, by Archbishop Benson in his book on the cathedral, that the Canons of the cathedral should be officially associated with different forms of diocesan work. I very much doubt whether this is desirable, except as regards the Archdeacons. It seems to me that it is far better that the Canons should be left free to develop their own work

on their own lines. In some cases they would give up their time to study, in others to preaching—possibly of a mission character—in others a natural bent would lead them to take part in diocesan business work. It would make the appointments very difficult if, in the case of the appointment of each Canon, he had to be selected for some particular work. In our cathedral private beneficence has associated the Canon Missioner with the work of the cathedral. I must own that I am not yet convinced that that is the wisest arrangement, and I feel that the whole organization of mission work in relation to a diocese requires more thought than I have yet been able to give it.

To come now specially to the case of Gloucester, there is one reform which is recommended by the Commission, and which it ought to be our aim to see carried out. It is recognized, I think, now that the association of a canonry with a mastership of an Oxford College is, under present circumstances, a mistake. It may have been quite a useful arrangement in the past, but at the present time public opinion demands that the office of master of a college should be a full-time appointment, and that the office of a Canon should be a full-time appointment. I hope that in the course of time it may be found possible to separate the two offices.

There is another point to which I must draw attention. It was on several occasions represented to us how inconvenient it was that while in some cathedrals all the Canonries were in the gift of the Bishop, in other cathedrals none were so, and it has been suggested that there should be some exchange arranged with the Crown and the Lord Chancellor in this connection.

I would venture to suggest as regards Gloucester that what we should look forward to in the future is that there should be six Canons; three of them, as at present, should be in the appointment of the Lord Chancellor, but the other three, consisting of the two Archdeacons and Canon Missioner (if he remains a member of the Chapter) should be in the gift of the Bishop of the diocese.

To pass now to the question of emolument. I think, in the first place, it is important that the question of official houses should be considered. All the evidence that we had before us has made it apparent that the custom of making the holders of an office responsible for the upkeep of an official house is not one that works well. In some cases the house is left for years in a state of bad repair; in other cases someone who holds an office for a very short time may have been compelled to expend a large amount of money in putting the house in order. Moreover, official houses are generally in the nature of things large houses. It is desirable, if it can be afforded, that they should be so. Part of the duties of the Dean and Canons as resident in the Cathedral city are clearly those of hospitality, and my experience has been, both here and elsewhere, that such duties are generally well performed. It would be far fairer if it were recognized that the official houses should be kept up by the corporation for the benefit of those who occupy them, and the rates and taxes be paid; some allowance, of course, would be made for this in assessing the incomes. As regards emolument, I do not think a Dean ought to have less than £1,500 a year, or a residentiary Canon less than £800, which would mean in the case of an Archdeacon £1,000.

To pass to the Honorary Canons. I would like to draw your attention to the remarks made by the Deans of Wells, Lichfield, and Salisbury:

"Then came the ill-informed Cathedral Act of 1840. All prebends were disendowed, and the benefices attached to them were swept into the net of episcopal patronage. It is said that when the Bill was under discussion in Parliament the proposal to continue the prebends as honorary offices, though their endowments were abolished, was greeted with derision. Nevertheless, it was carried, and the experience of the loyalty of the modern clergy to opportunity of service apart from remuneration paved the way for the Act of 1852, by which honorary canonries were founded in connection with the cathedrals of the new foundation. But unfortunately that connection is of the slightest. They bear no comparison with the

(honorary) prebends of the other type of cathedral. An Honorary Canon, it is true, is formally installed in the cathedral; but there his association with it ceases. He has no stall, no place in the Chapter, no vote, no preaching turn (of right). Still the jejune title is prized. The office, if it were duly incorporated in the life and work of the cathedral, would be still more highly valued, and it would be of practical value to the diocese."

I am quite sure that it would be of great value to the cathedral and to the diocese if there were a closer association between the Honorary Canons and the Cathedral body as is here suggested. It has been proposed that they should have some voice in the management of the cathedral. That, I think, would be unwise. There are really quite enough people interested in that already. And it has been proposed, again, that they should have certain rights of preaching. That again would be of doubtful value, for many of them would not be great preachers, and it is probable that those who were less efficient would be most anxious to exercise their privileges. I think, in the first place, it should be clearly recognized that they are members of the Cathedral body, and that their position as such should be definitely specified in the statutes. Secondly, I think that if the present system of the election of Bishops is preserved, they should be in all cases members of the Greater Chapter who are summoned for the election of a Bishop. Then, thirdly, I should give them a specific right to be summoned to assist in the services of the cathedral, or to take the place of one of the residentiary Canons if invited to do so. I think that this last privilege would probably come to mean a good deal more as time went on, for if, as I hope, cathedrals are made greater use of and more intimately associated with the work of the diocese there will be a demand for more clergy to assist in the services, and it might quite well arise that it would become customary to summon them from time to time to give their assistance.

There is one more suggestion that I should like to make which has occurred to me, and that is this: It would be a

great advantage to the cathedral if it were possible to associate closely with it some of the prominent Church laymen of the diocese; there is precedent for Prebendaries of cathedrals being laymen. And I would venture to suggest that it would be a great gain if there were to be added to the number of Honorary Canons an equal number of laymen who would, like them, have the distinction of being members of the Cathedral body, who would have, like them, a right to a stall, and who might be members of the Greater Chapter for the election of the Bishop. If, then, in time to come the present system of appointing Bishops by the Crown were to lapse, we should have in the Cathedral body, of the Dean, the Residentiary Canons and the Honorary Canons or Prebendaries, clerical and lay, perhaps the most suitable body for exercising this function.

I pass now to the Minor Canons. In a cathedral founded by Henry VIII. none of the difficulties arise which exist in the older cathedrals with regard to separate corporations of Vicars-choral. I would, however, like to say that on this matter I do not feel inclined to a conservative point of view. I cannot conceive that there is any advantage in the continual existence of these separate corporations, and I venture to hope that one result of the reform of the cathedrals may be that in all cases they will be abolished, and that their place will be taken by Minor Canons appointed specifically for the work that they have to do, and that they shall be appointed only for a limited period. It is suggested that the appointment of two would be sufficient in any cathedral. That would probably be the case if they were whole-time appointments, but I think that really it would be better that the number should be larger, that the remuneration should be comparatively small, and that they should be compelled, except perhaps in the case of the two senior ones, who would hold the offices of Precentor and Sacristan, to do other work outside the cathedral. I cannot think that it would be a good thing that anyone should be appointed for the continuous duty

of singing the service in church without any pastoral work associated with it.

The only suggestion that I have to make with regard to the organist, or master of choristers and the choir, is that sufficient money should be provided to insure that the organist is properly paid. It was quite clearly brought to our notice that in no case do the organists of the cathedrals receive the emolument that they ought to expect; they hardly, in fact, receive a living wage. Also it is undesirable that they should be compelled to spend too much of their time in giving lessons to make up for the inadequacy of their stipend.

If a cathedral is to fulfil larger duties to the diocese it will undoubtedly require a larger staff of vergers. I notice that the statutes require the appointment of two subsacrists and two vergers and four poor men, who were to assist the subsacrists and the vergers. I think that that represents the staff which a cathedral like Gloucester would require, and I hope that in the scheme of increased endowments or the reorganization of finance, such needs should be considered.

In the meantime I would venture to make a strong appeal to the Dean and Canons to consider how far they can meet the expressed desire of the diocese for the opening of the Cathedral without any payment throughout the day. I would point out:

1. That the experience of other cathedrals has been that the voluntary offerings that they receive when the cathedral is open exceed the payments formerly made. Many people would give more than sixpence for the privilege of walking about the Cathedral unhampered. The number of persons who would visit the Cathedral would be largely increased. The small contributions of large bodies of persons would quickly mount up. A spirit of goodwill would make much difference.

2. If all the payments were voluntary offerings there would be no income tax to pay on them. That at present amounts, I believe, to £150.

3. The difficulties that so many people find in visiting

the Cloisters and so much of the Cathedral may become serious. Only yesterday, as I was coming out of the Choir at twenty minutes to four, I was met by a party who could not wait until after the service, who were refused admission as it was too near service time. If the Cathedral had been open they might quite well have seen what they desired. It must be remembered that the Office of Works is most anxious to get hold of cathedrals, and if complaints arise of inaccessibility, they will make use of them to attain their end.

4. A considerable sum could still be made by charging for admission to the Crypt and Clerestory.

5. At Chester the Cathedral is kept open in summer after the time when the Vergers leave by voluntary help.

6. If the Chapter were to put forward a scheme of a reasonable character showing the cost of guarding the building, a guarantee fund would, I do not doubt, be raised. But I must express strongly my opinion that the risk at the present time is very slight. There would be ample opportunities of doing damage in the Nave even now, if there were any desire to do so. It is not regularly patrolled.

7. The more the whole Cathedral is fitted up as a home of religion, the less irreverence is likely to be shown.

I have a strong opinion that if the Dean and Canons were to adopt an adventurous policy, they would not suffer from it; they would get a great deal of unexpected support.

Another side of the Cathedral work which has suffered in the past for want of funds has been the library. I notice so often, when I visit ancient institutions like cathedrals, that they contain what was really a well-selected library of the seventeenth century, and that since that time they have not been kept up to date. The difficulty has been twofold. It has been want of funds and want of space. As regards the latter point, I would venture to suggest that the large galleries in the clerestories of our cathedrals may well be used for the storage of books which are no longer in regular use. There is ample space:

they are beautifully dry, and no harm at all would accrue to the library by such books being preserved there. That would give the necessary space, and I would venture to suggest to the Dean and Chapter that in no way could they better serve the interests of theological learning among the clergy of the diocese than by providing a library where any who wish could come and work, and from which, subject to the necessary rules and regulations, the clergy would be able to borrow books. Attempts are made from time to time to provide such a library from voluntary sources, but they are never really a success. There would almost certainly be one of the Canons who would be admirably fitted for the office of librarian. He should have an assistant librarian, who would be paid a salary for his work, who would be in regular attendance when the library was open, and whose business it should be to send the books which were borrowed to the clergy in the country. Such a library, if once organized, would be the recipient undoubtedly of many gifts. Clergy, when they give up their work, or die, often have great difficulties in knowing what they shall do with their books, and they would naturally present them to such a library. The provision of no excessive sum for the purchase of books each year would quickly enable a library to be created of great value to all the clergy of the diocese.

I have finally to speak about the Cathedral School which bears the name of the King's School. There is no doubt that at the present time the position of the older endowed schools is a matter of considerable difficulty, unless they happen to have endowments. Though the position is difficult, I do not think the need of them is any less. Under recent Education Acts, and by the provision of large sums of public money, many new schools have been founded, and no doubt in many ways they fill up a gap. But it is equally true that many schools have been destroyed. The old-fashioned grammar school has changed into a school of a modern type, which may be useful but gives very little which any person could seriously describe as education. There is, further, the very

serious question of religious teaching and influence. I do not think that it will be found in the future that these modern secondary schools are altogether a healthy influence in the country. At any rate, it seems to me of the greatest importance that, wherever possible, schools especially associated with the work of the Church, giving a different type of education to the more public schools and having a different outlook on life, should be preserved. The association of a school like the King's School with the Cathedral choir is another advantage. I do not think that education with a large musical element would be good for everybody or in every school, but the larger the amount of education given in the country the greater the variety should be, and I have no doubt at all that in certain directions the musical training which a choir boy receives is of great value in the development of his character and capacities. I know the difficulties with which the Dean and Chapter are faced, and at the present time the competition—often unfair competition—of education authorities makes it hard to develop a school. Exactly on what lines the King's School should be organized I would not venture to lay down explicitly. I am sure that the problem is one which demands care and consideration, and that every effort should be made to obtain adequate funds from the Ecclesiastical Commissioners for developing the King's School as part of the Cathedral foundation.

I have not said anything explicitly about the fabric. I think my point of view with regard to that has been made clear in the earlier part of this charge. It is of grave importance that there should be a fabric fund for the cathedral of sufficient size to enable all the necessary repairs of the buildings to be done without needless delay. If, then, at any time there was some special demand it might well be supplemented by an appeal to the diocese, but that appeal to the diocese ought not to be necessitated by neglect of the work necessary each year. I think it is as well to remember that probably in almost all cases the old endowments of the cathedrals were larger than those that they at present enjoy: in the case of some cathedrals

they were much larger. A considerable proportion of the revenue of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners comes from the property which used to be held by such bodies as the Dean and Chapter of St. Paul's and the Dean and Chapter of Durham, and I cannot help thinking that the first charge on these combined emoluments ought to be the upkeep of our cathedrals. I do not think that Westminster Abbey, or St. George's Chapel, or Lincoln Cathedral, ought to have been allowed to get into such a state as they are, one which has compelled a somewhat excessive appeal for funds. Certainly it has seemed to me most improper that when it was found that the fabric fund of Westminster Abbey was not sufficient a Canonry should have been suppressed in order to provide the funds required.

I do not know that I have much more to say. Our cathedrals are some of the most treasured inheritances in the country. The care of them is of grave importance, both from the point of view of the Church and the nation. The demand in this diocese, and I think in all dioceses, for close association with the cathedral by all those interested in our religious life is increasing. The appeal cathedrals and their services make, if those services are adapted to the needs and outlook of the present day, is not less than it was but greater. It is diffused over far more classes of the population, and I am sure that if the Dean and Chapter are prepared to go forward and adapt the cathedral more and more to the conditions of the present day and to the needs of the people, they will have the hearty support of the whole diocese. I do not think, quite apart from the question of further endowments from the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, that they need fear to take some risk in the development of its use and worship.

APPENDIX

CONTAINING extracts from formularies of the English Church and leading Anglican Divines of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, illustrating the position of the English Church, especially in relation to the Church of Rome.

NOTE

These quotations have been selected from men of all parties in the Church of the seventeenth century, and illustrate their different points of view. It is well, however, to insist on the measure of their agreement. They all:

1. Repudiate Papal claims.
2. Denounce Roman corruptions.
3. Exaggerate their differences with the Council of Trent.
4. And distinguish between the Pope and Curia on the one hand, and the Churches of France, Spain and Italy on the other.

They all maintain:

1. The unbroken continuity of the Church of England.
2. That she is Catholic in Faith and Practice.
3. And that, though communion has been interrupted, she is one with the Churches of France, Spain and Italy. The quarrels of sisters do not destroy their relationship.

In stating that they all maintain the Church of England to be Catholic, it is not meant that they agreed about what was Catholic, any more than men do now. A few of them earnestly desired and worked for reunion, but most were too full of the controversial spirit.

H. MAYNARD SMITH.

I

FORMULARIES AND PRONOUNCEMENTS OF MORE OR LESS AUTHORITY

1. The Bishop's Book. 1537.
2. The XIII Articles. 1538.
3. The King's Book. 1543.
4. XLII Articles. 1553. Passage quoted unchanged in 1571.
5. XI Articles. 1559.
6. Canons. 1604.
7. Canons. 1606.
8. Translators of the Bible. 1611.
9. Irish Articles. 1615.
10. Canons. 1640.

THE BISHOP'S BOOK

1537

THE INSTITUTION OF A CHRISTIAN MAN

I do believe that the Church of Rome is not, nor cannot worthily be called the Catholic Church, but only a particular member thereof, and cannot challenge or vindicate of right, and by the word of God, to be head of this universal Church, or to have any superiority over the other Churches of Christ which be in England, France, Spain, or in any other realm, but that they be all free from any subjection unto the said Church of Rome, or unto the minister or bishop of the same.

And I believe also, that the said Church of Rome, with all the other particular Churches in the world, compacted and united together, do make and constitute but one Catholic Church or body. And that like as our Saviour Christ is one person, and the only head of his mystical body, so this whole Catholic Church, Christ's mystical body, is but one body under this one head Christ.[1]

[1] Lloyd's ed., Oxon., 1825, pp. 55, 56.

XIII ARTICLES

1538

Ecclesia præter alias acceptiones in scripturis duas habet præcipuas: unam, qua Ecclesia accipitur pro congregatione omnium sanctorum et vere fidelium, qui Christo capiti vere credunt et sanctificantur Spiritu ejus. Hæc autem vivum est et vere sanctum Christi corpus mysticum, sed soli Deo cognitum, qui hominum corda solus intuetur. Altera acceptio est qua Ecclesia accipitur pro congregatione omnium hominum qui baptizati sunt in Christo et non palam abnegarunt Christum, nec juste et per ejus verbum sunt excommunicati. Ista Ecclesiæ acceptio congruit ejus statui in hac vita duntaxat, in qua boni malis sunt admixti et debet esse cognita ut possit audiri juxta illud: " Qui Ecclesiam non audierit," etc. Cognoscitur autem per professionem Evangelii et communionem sacramentorum. Hæc est Ecclesia catholica et apostolica, quæ non Episcopatus Romani aut cujusvis alterius Ecclesiæ finibus circumscribitur sed universas totius Christianismi complectitur Ecclesias, quæ simul unam efficiunt catholicam. In hac autem catholica Ecclesia nulla particularis Ecclesia, sive Romana illa fuerit, sive quævis alia, ex institutione Christi supra alias Ecclesias eminentiam vel auctoritatem ullam vindicare potest. Est vero hæc Ecclesia una, non quod in terris unum aliquod caput, seu unum quendam vicarium sub Christo habeat aut habuerit unquam, (quod sibi jam diu Pontifex Romanus divini juris prætextu vindicavit, cum tamen revera divino jure nihil amplius illi sit concessum quam alii cuivis episcopo,) sed ideo una dicitur, quia universi Christiani in vinculo pacis colligati unum caput Christum agnoscunt, cujus se profitentur esse corpus, unum agnoscunt Dominum, unam fidem, unum baptisma, unum Deum ac Patrem omnium, etc.[1]

[1] Hardwick, " History of XXXIX Articles," 263, 264.

THE KING'S BOOK

1543

THE ERUDITION FOR ANY CHRISTIAN MAN

The unity therefore of the church is not conserved by the bishop of Rome's authority or doctrine; but the unity of the catholic church, which all Christian men in this article do profess, is conserved and kept by the help and assistance of the Holy Spirit of God, in retaining and maintaining of such doctrine and profession of Christian faith, and true observance of the same, as is taught by the scripture and the doctrine apostolic. . . . And this unity of the holy church of Christ is not divided by distance of place nor by diversity of traditions and ceremonies, diversely observed in divers churches, for good order of the same. . . . The church of England, Spain, Italy, and Poole [Portugal ?] be not separate from the unity, but be one church in God, notwithstanding that among them there is great distance of place, diversity of traditions, not in all things unity of opinions, etc. . . . As the church of Rome doth affirm certain of their laws and ordinances to be of such estimation that they be of equal force with the word of God, and that whosoever disobeyeth or transgresseth the same committeth deadly sin; yet we perceiving the same to be discrepant from the truth of scripture, must needs therein dissent from them. . . . And therefore the church of Rome, being but a several church, challenging that name of *catholic* above all other, doeth great wrong to all other churches, and doeth only by force and maintenance support an unjust usurpation : for that church hath no more right to that name than the church of France, Spain, England, or Portugal, which be justly called catholic churches, in that they do profess, consent, and agree in one unity of true faith with other catholic churches. . . . It is to be noted, that this church of England, and other known particular churches, in which Christ's name is truly

honoured, called on, and professed in faith and baptism, be members of the whole catholic church, when they merely profess and teach the faith and religion of Christ, according to the scripture and the apostolic doctrine.[1]

XLII ARTICLES. XXXIX ARTICLES

1553. NO CHANGE IN 1571

No. XX. Sicut erravit Ecclesia Hierosolymitana, Alexandrina, et Antiochena, ita erravit et Ecclesia Romana, non solum quoad agenda et ceremoniarum ritus, verum in hiis etiam quæ credenda sunt.

XI ARTICLES

1559

Moreover, touching the Bishop of Rome, I do acknowledge and confess, that by the Scriptures and Word of God he hath no more authority than other bishops have in their provinces and dioceses; and therefore the power, which he now challengeth, that is, to be the supreme head of the universal Church of Christ, and to be above all emperors, kings, and princes, is an usurped power, contrary to the Scriptures and Word of God, and contrary to the example of the primitive Church, and therefore is for most just causes taken away and abolished in this realm.[2]

THE CANONS OF 1604

Canon XXX. So far was it from the purpose of the Church of England to forsake and reject the Churches of Italy, France, Spain, Germany, or any such like Churches, in all things which they held and practised, that, as the Apology of the Church of England confesseth, it doth with reverence retain those ceremonies, which doth neither endamage the Church of God, nor offend the minds

[1] See Lloyd's edition, Oxford, 1825, pp. 246-248.
[2] From Hardwick, "History of the Articles," p. 358.

of sober men; and only departed from them in those particular points, wherein they were fallen both from themselves in their ancient integrity, and from the Apostolical Churches, which were their first founders.

CANONS OF 1606

BOOK II

IV. If any man shall affirm . . . that St. Peter himself (who our adversaries would make the world believe, was then the highest bishop) concurring with the apostle St. Paul, when he commanded the Christians in those days to submit themselves unto the king, as unto the superior . . . did leave this doctrine, so jointly taught, to be dispensed with afterward by any pope, his vicar, led by what spirit is easy to be discerned . . . he doth greatly err.

V. If any man shall affirm, under colour of anything that is in the scriptures, either that our Saviour Christ was not the head of the church from the beginning of it; or that all the particular churches in the world are otherwise to be termed one church, than as He himself is the head of it. . . or that our Saviour Christ hath not appointed under him several ecclesiastical governors, to rule and direct the said particular churches . . . or that he did more appoint any one chief bishop to rule all the particular churches, which should be planted throughout all kingdoms, than he did appoint any one king to rule and govern all the particular kingdoms in the world . . . he doth greatly err.

VIII. If any man shall affirm . . . that it is not a sound argument, that the bishops of Rome, in taking upon them to be temporal kings, have wholly perverted the institution of Christ in that behalf . . . he doth greatly err.

IX. If any man shall affirm . . . that ever the apostles, in their days, either preached or writ that the ecclesiastical commonwealth could not be perfect except St. Peter for his time, and after him the bishops of Rome,

should have temporal power and authority to depose emperors and kings, that the church might attain her spiritual end; or that the church in their days did not attain to her spiritual end, although no such authority was then either challenged or put in practice . . . he doth greatly err.

X. If any man shall affirm . . . that, seeing our Saviour Christ held it expedient for his catholic church that he should deprive her of his corporal presence, that she might be ruled by the Holy Ghost, it is not to be thought great presumption for any man to tell us that his corporal presence is necessary for the government of the said catholic church, as if he meant to put the Holy Ghost out of possession . . . or that the said one catholic church of Christ (as He is the chief bishop over all) is otherwise visible on the earth than by the several and particular churches in it, and sometimes by general and free councils lawfully assembled; or that it is a better consequent, that if the catholic church have no visible head, all other bishops, doctors, pastors, and ministers are needless . . . or that the intolerable pride of the bishop of Rome, for the time still being, through the advancement of himself, by many sleights, stratagems, and false miracles, over the catholic church, (the temple of God) as if he were God himself, doth not argue him plainly to be the man of sin mentioned by the apostle . . . he doth greatly err.[1]

THE TRANSLATORS OF THE BIBLE
1611

DEDICATORY EPISTLE
The Pope, the Man of Sin

"Your Majesty . . . by writing in defence of the Truth . . . hath given such a blow unto that man of sin, as will not be healed."

[1] These Canons passed both Houses of Convocation, but never received the Royal assent. They are found in the so-called Convocation Book of Bishop Overall, and reprinted by Cardwell, "Synodalia," vol. i., pp. 330-379.

THE IRISH ARTICLES OF RELIGION
1615

59. The Pope neither of himselfe, nor by any authoritie of the Church or Se of Rome, or by any other meanes with any other, hath any power or authoritie to depose the King, or dispose any of his Kingdomes or Dominions, or to authorise any other Prince to inuade or annoy him or his Countries, or to discharge any of his subjects of their allegeance and obedience to his Majestie, or to give licence or leaue to any of them to beare armes, raise tumult, or to offer any violence or hurt to his Royall person, state, or gouernement, or to any of his subiects within his Majesties Dominions.

60. That Princes, which be excommunicated or depriued by the Pope, may be deposed or murthered by their subiects, or any other whatsoeuer, is impious doctrine.

67. The Popish doctrine of Equiuocation and mentall Reseruation, is most vngodly, and tendeth plainely to the subuersion of all humaine society.

77. Follows XX Article of Church of England.

78. Follows XIX Article of Church of England.

79. Follows the extract from XI Article.

80. The Bishop of Rome is so farre from being the supreame head of the vniuersall Church of Christ, that his workes and doctrine doe plainely discover him to bee *that man of sinne*, foretold in the holy Scriptures, *whome the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and abolish with the brightness of his comming.*[1]

[1] From Hardwick, "History of the Articles," pp. 381-384.

CANONS 1640

VI. An oath enjoined for the preventing of all innovations in doctrine and government.

I, A. B. do swear that I do approve the doctrine, and discipline, or government established in the church of England, as containing all things necessary to salvation: and that I will not endeavour by myself or any other, directly or indirectly to bring in any popish doctrine, contrary to that which is so established: nor will I ever give my consent to alter the government of this church by archbishops, bishops, deans, and archdeacons, etc. as it stands now established, and as by right it ought to stand, nor yet ever to subject it to the usurpations and superstitions of the see of Rome.[1]

[1] "Synodalia," vol. i., p. 402. This is part of the famous etcetera oath. The Puritans fastened on the etc., and refused to swear.

II

ILLUSTRATIVE QUOTATIONS FROM LEADING ANGLICAN DIVINES OF THE SIXTEENTH AND SEVENTEENTH CENTURIES

Cuthbert Tunstall - 1474-1559
John Jewel - - - 1522–1571
William Whitaker 1548–1595
Lancelot Andrewes 1555–1626
Isaac Casaubon - 1559–1614
Richard Hooker - 1554–1600
Richard Field - - 1561–1616
Sir Edwyn Sandys 1561–1629
Sir Henry Wotton 1568–1639
William Bedell - 1571–1642
William Laud - - 1573–1645
Joseph Hall - - 1574–1656
John Davenant - 1576–1641
Richard Montague 1577–1641
John Prideaux (see Gilbert Sheldon) 1578–1660
James Usher - - 1581–1656
John Selden - - 1584–1654
John Hales - - 1584–1656
Robert Sanderson - 1587–1663
Sir George Radcliffe 1593–1657
John Bramhall - 1594–1665
John Cosin - - 1594–1672
Gilbert Sheldon - 1598–1650
Herbert Thorndike 1598–1672
William Chillingworth - - - 1602–1644
Sir Kenelm Digby - 1603–1665
Herbert Croft - - 1603–1691
Henry Hammond - 1605–1660
Sir Thomas Browne 1605–1682
Robert Leighton - 1611–1684
Jeremy Taylor - 1613–1667
Nathanael Culverwel - - - - 1617–1651
John Evelyn - - 1620–1706
Isaac Barrow - - 1630–1677
George Bull - - 1634–1710
Robert South - - 1634–1716
Edward Stillingfleet 1635–1699
William Beveridge - 1637–1708
Daniel Whitby - 1638–1726
Gilbert Burnet - 1643–1715
William Wake - 1657–1737

CUTHBERT TUNSTALL

1474-1559

HIS LETTER TO CARDINAL POLE JUSTIFYING HENRY VIII

Ye presuppose for a ground, the king's grace to be swerved from the unity of Crist's church, and that in taking upon him the title of supreme head of the church of Englonde, he intendeth to separate his church of Englond from the unity of the whole body of Cristendom; taking upon him the office belonging to spiritual men, grounded in the scripture, of the immediate cure of souls, and

attribute to himself that belongeth to priesthood, as to preach and teach the word of God, and to minister the sacraments, and that he doth not know what longeth to a Cristen king's office, and what unto priesthood; wherein surely both you and all other so thinking of him, do err too far. . . . For, his full purpose and intent is, to see the laws of Almighty God purely and sincerely preached and taught, and Cristes faith without blot kept and observed in his realm; and not to separate himself, or his realm, any wise from the unity of Crist's catholic church, but inviolably, at all times, to keep and observe the same; and to reduce his church of Englond out of all captivity of foreign powers, heretofore usurped therein, into the pristine estate, that all churches of all realms were in at the beginning; and to abolish, and clearly to put away such usurpation, as heretofore in this realm the bishops of Rome have, by many undue means, increased to their great advantage, and impoverishing of this realm, and the king's subjects of the same. July 13th, 1536.[1]

JOHN JEWEL

1522-1571

APOLOGY FOR THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

(*Works : Parker Society, Vol. I.*)

P. 59. We believe that there is one Church of God, and that the same is not shut up (as in times past among the Jews) into some one corner or kingdom, but that it is catholic and universal, and dispersed throughout the whole world; so that there is now no nation which can truly complain that they be shut forth, and may not be one of the Church and people of God; and that this Church is the kingdom, the body, and the spouse of Christ; and that Christ alone is the prince of this kingdom; that Christ alone is the head of this body; and that Christ alone is the bridegroom of this spouse.

[1] The letter is printed in full in Burnet's "Records." *Vide* Pocock's edition, vol. vi., p. 179.

P. 77. It is doubtless an odious matter for one to leave the fellowship whereunto he hath been accustomed, and specially of those men, who, though they be not, yet at least seem and be called Christians. And to say truly, we do not despise the Church of these men (howsoever it be ordered by them now-a-days), partly for the name sake itself, and partly for that the gospel of Jesu Christ hath once been therein truly and purely set forth. Neither had we departed therefrom, but of very necessity and much against our wills.

P. 79. As touching that we have now done, to depart from that church, whose errors were proved and made manifest to the world, which church also had already evidently departed from God's word; and yet not to depart so much from itself, as from the errors thereof; and not to do this disorderly or wickedly, but quietly and soberly—we have done nothing herein against the doctrine either of Christ, or of his apostles. For neither is the church of God such, as it may not be dusked with some spot, or asketh not sometime reparation. Else what needeth there so many assemblies and councils, without the which, as saith Egidius, the christian faith is not able to stand?

WILLIAM WHITAKER
1548-1595

REGIUS PROFESSOR OF DIVINITY AT CAMBRIDGE

Thesis De Antichristo in Comitiis Cantabrigiensis.

To prove the Pope was Antichrist. The book was sufficiently important for Cardinal Bellarmine to answer.

LANCELOT ANDREWES
1555-1626

"Our religion," says Andrewes, "you miscall modern sectarian opinions. I tell you if they are modern, they are not ours; our appeal is to antiquity—yea, even to

NORWICH PUBLIC LIBRARIES

the most extreme antiquity. We do not innovate; it may be we renovate what was customary with those same ancients, but with you has disappeared in novelties. Nor have you a right to throw Gregory in our teeth as if we failed to give him due reverence; as if we did not cordially embrace all that his writings contain of the sense of old councils and Fathers. It is in your eyes that Gregory the Great is small. The seventh Gregory suits your interest better than the first. . . . Subjection to Rome, dependence on Rome—this is the sum of your religion."[1]

Blessed be God that, among divers other mysteries about which there are so many mists and clouds of controversies raised in all ages, and even in this of ours, hath yet left us some clear and without controversy; manifest and yet great . . . so manifest, as no question to be made about them. Withal, to reform our judgments in this point. For a false conceit is crept into the minds of men, to think the points of religion that be manifest to be certain petty points, scarce worth the hearing. Those —yea, those be great, and none but those, that have great disputes about them. It is not so . . . . Those that are necessary He hath made plain; those that are not plain not necessary. . . . A way of peace then there shall be, whereof all parts shall agree, even in the midst of a world of controversies. That there need not such ado in complaining, if men did not delight rather to be treading mazes than to walk in the ways of peace.[2]

One canon reduced to writing by God Himself, two testaments, three creeds, four general councils, five centuries, and the series of Fathers in that period—the three centuries, that is, before Constantine, and two after, determine the boundary of our faith."[3]

For a long while have we been making our appeal to a council, but to a council duly summoned; a council in which business is conducted in the same manner and order

[1] "Tortura Torti" (trans. Ottley), p. 96.
[2] "Sermon on the Nativity," vol. iii., p. 35.
[3] "Opusc. Posthuma," p. 91.

as in the first famous four; wherein there is liberty of voting; wherein prejudice is not set in place of judgment; wherein he sits not as judge, who should be treated as defendant; wherein there are no titular or unreal (*factitii*) bishops; wherein the number is reduced of those Italian prelates who, by the quantity of their votes, outweigh all the other Bishops of Europe put together.[1]

ISAAC CASAUBON
1559-1614

Romana igitur Ecclesia, Græca, Antiochara, Ægyptia, Abyssina, Moschovitica, et plures aliæ, membra sunt, doctrina quidem et fidei sinceritate multum præstantia alia aliis, sed tamen membra Ecclesia Catholicæ; cujus compages, quod ad formam exteriorem dudum est soluta.[2]

RICHARD HOOKER
1554-1600

The Church of Christ which was from the beginning is and continueth unto the end: of which Church all parts have not been always equally sincere and sound. . . . In St. Paul's time the integrity of Rome was famous; Corinth many ways reproved; they of Galatia much more out of square. In St. John's time Ephesus and Smyrna in far better state than Thyatira and Pergamus were. We hope therefore that to reform ourselves, if at any time we have done amiss, is not to sever ourselves from the Church we were of before. In the Church we were, and we are so still. Other difference between our estate before and now we know none but only such as we see in Juda; which having sometime been idolatrous became afterwards more soundly religious by renouncing idolatry and superstition. . . . The indisposition therefore of the Church of Rome to reform herself must be no stay unto us from performing our duty to God; even as desire of

[1] " Responsio," p. 216.
[2] "Ad Cardinalem Perronium," p. 14.

retaining conformity with them could be no excuse if we did not perform that duty.

Notwithstanding so far as lawfully we may, we have held and do hold fellowship with them. For even as the Apostle doth say of Israel that they are in one respect enemies but in another beloved of God; in like sort with Rome we dare not communicate concerning sundry her gross and grievous abominations, yet touching those main parts of Christian truth wherein they constantly still persist, we gladly acknowledge them to be of the family of Jesus Christ; and our hearty prayer unto God Almighty is, that being conjoined so far forth with them, they may at the length (if it be his will) so yield to frame and reform themselves, that no distraction remain in anything, but that we "all may with one heart and one mouth glorify God the Father of our Lord and Saviour," whose Church we are.[1]

In case the people of God and Belial do chance to be neighbours, then as the danger of infection is greater, so the same difference they say is thereby made more necessary. In this respect as the Jews were severed from the heathen, so most especially from the heathen nearest them. And in the same respect we, which ought to differ howsoever from the Church of Rome, are now they say by reason of our nearness more bound to differ from them in ceremonies than from Turks. A strange kind of speech unto Christian ears, and such as I hope they themselves do acknowledge unadvisedly uttered. "We are not so much to fear infection from Turks as from papists." What of that? we must remember that by conforming rather ourselves in that respect to Turks, we should be spreaders of a worse infection into others than any we are likely to draw from papists by our conformity with them in ceremonies. If they did hate, as Turks do, the Christians; or as Canaanites did of old the Jewish religion even in gross; the circumstance of local nearness in them unto us might haply enforce in us a duty of greater separation from them than from those other mentioned. But

[1] "Eccles. Pol.," book iii., ch. i., p. 10.

forasmuch as papists are so much in Christ nearer unto us than Turks, is there any reasonable man, trow you, but will judge it meeter that our ceremonies of Christian religion should be popish than Turkish or heathenish? Especially considering that we were not brought to dwell amongst them, (as Israel in Canaan,) having not been of them. For even a very part of them we were. And when God did by his good Spirit put it into our hearts, first to reform ourselves, (whence grew our separation,) and then by all good means to seek also their reformation; had we not only cut off their corruptions but also estranged ourselves from them in things indifferent, who seeth not how greatly prejudicial this might have been to so good a cause, and what occasion it had given them to think (to their greater obduration in evil) that through a froward or wanton desire of innovation we did unconstrainedly those things for which conscience was pretended? . . .

They which measure religion by dislike of the Church of Rome think every man so much the more sound, by how much he can make the corruptions thereof to seem more large. . . . They can say, that in doctrine, in discipline, in prayers, in sacraments, the Church of Rome hath (as it hath indeed) very foul and gross corruptions; the nature whereof notwithstanding, because they have not for the most part exact skill and knowledge to discern, they think that amiss many times which is not; and the salve of reformation they mightily call for, but where and what the sores are which need it, as they wot full little, so they think it not greatly material to search. . . . They reply, that to draw men from great excess, it is not amiss though we use them unto somewhat less than is competent; and that a crooked stick is not straightened unless it be bent as far on the clean contrary side, that so it may settle itself at the length in a middle estate of evenness between both. But how can these comparisons stand them in any stead? When they urge us to extreme opposition against the Church of Rome, do they mean we should be drawn unto it only for a time, and afterwards return to a mediocrity? or was it the purpose of

those reformed churches, which utterly abolished all popish ceremonies, to come in the end back again to the middle point of evenness and moderation? . . . That the Church of Rome doth hereby take occasion to blaspheme, and to say, our religion is not able to stand of itself unless it lean upon the staff of their ceremonies . . . whereas in truth the ceremonies which we have taken from such as were before us, are not things that belong to this or that sect, but they are the ancient rites and customs of the Church of Christ, whereof ourselves being a part, we have the selfsame interest in them which our fathers before us had, from whom the same are descended unto us. Again, in case we had been so much beholding privately unto them, doth the reputation to one church stand by saying unto another, "I need thee not?" . . . When we are in a fretting mood at the Church of Rome, and with that angry disposition enter into any cogitation of the orders and rites of our church; taking particular survey of them, we are sure to have always one eye fixed upon the countenance of our enemies, and according to the blithe or heavy aspect thereof, our other eye sheweth some other suitable token either of dislike or approbation towards our own orders. . . . We have most heartily to thank God, therefore, that they amongst us to whom the first consultations of causes of this kind fell, were men which aiming at another mark, namely the glory of God and the good of this his church, took that which they judged thereunto necessary, not rejecting any good or convenient thing only because the Church of Rome might perhaps like it.[1]

[1] "Eccles. Polity," book iv., pp. 7-10. Note also Sermon II. in vol. iii., in which Hooker shows in what we agree with Rome and in what we disagree. He argues that R.C.'s may be saved. This sermon, preached at Paul's Cross, occasioned Travers' supplication and Hooker's reply.

RICHARD FIELD
1561-1616

I will first shew, that all our best and most renowned Divines did ever acknowledge as much as I have written. (2) That the Romane Church is not the same now, it was when Luther began. And (3), that we have not departed from the Church wherein our Fathers lived and died, but only from the faction that was in it. Touching the first, M. Luther confesseth that much good, nay that all good, and the very marrow and kernell of faith, piety, and Christian beliefe, was by the happy providence of God, preserved even in the midst of all the confusions of the Papacy. M. Calvine in like sort sheweth that the true Church remained under the Papacie. Cum dominus fœdus suum (saith he) in Gallia, Italia, Germania, Hispania, et Anglia disposuerit, ubi illæ provinciæ Antichristi tyrannide oppressæ sunt; quo tamen fœdus suum inviolabile maneret, Baptismum primo illic conservavit, qui ejus ore consecratus invita humana impictate, vim suam retinet: deinde sua providentia efficit, ut aliæ quoque reliquiæ extarent, ne Ecclesia prorsus interiret.[1]

SIR EDWYN SANDYS
1561-1629

The Romane Religion, which of all other Christian, I suppose to have most manifoldly declined and degenerated from the truth and puritie of that divine Original once so well published and placed amongst them . . . seemes notwithstanding at this day, not so corrupt in the very doctrine, as in Schooles they deliver it, and publish it in their writings; where manifold opposition doth hold them in awe, and hath caused them to refine it; as it is in the practice thereof, and in their usage among themselves; wherein they are as gross in a manner as

[1] "Of the Church," Appendix to part iii., ch. ii.

ever: so that sundry whom the reading of their books hath allured, the view of their Churches hath averted from their partie.[1]

Writers of Histories should know that there is a difference between their profession and the practice of advocates, pleading contrarie at a bar, where the wisedome of the Judge picketh the truth out of both sides, which is entire perhaps in neyther. And verily in this kind both the Protestants and Papists seeme generally in the greatest part of their stories, both to blame, though both not equally, having by their passionate reports much wronged the truth, abused this present age, and præjudiced posteritie (p. 99).

SIR HENRY WOTTON
1568-1639

He was a great enemy to wrangling Disputes of Religion; concerning which I shall say a little, both to testifie that, and to show the readiness of his Wit.

Having at his being in Rome made acquaintance with a pleasant Priest, who invited him one evening to hear their Vesper Musick at Church; the Priest seeing Sir Henry stand obscurely in a corner, sends to him by a Boy of the Quire, this Question, writ in a small piece of paper: Where was your Religion to be found before Luther? To which question Sir Henry presently underwrit, My Religion was to be found then, where yours is not to be found now, in the written Word of God.

The next Vesper, Sir Henry went purposely to the same Church, and sent one of the Quire boyes with this question to his honest pleasant friend, the Priest: Do you

[1] "Speculum Europæ," p. 3. Sir Edwyn travelled all over Europe and picked up a great deal to the discredit of the Roman Church, but he puts some of their arguments quite fairly, and he makes a good many admissions—the wealth of their devotional books, the good education in Jesuit schools, etc.

believe all those many thousands of poor Christians were damn'd, that were Excommunicated because the Pope and the Duke of Venice could not agree about their temporal power? even those poor Christains that knew not why they quarrel'd. Speak your conscience. To which he underwrit in French, Monsieur, excusay moy.

To one that asked him Whether a Papist may be saved? he replied, You may be saved without knowing that. Look to yourself. To another, whose earnestness exceeded his knowledge, and was still railing against the Papists, he gave this advice; Pray, Sir, forbear till you have studied the points better: for the wise Italians have this Proverb; He that understands amiss concludes worse. And take heed of thinking the farther you go from the Church of Rome, the nearer you are to God.[1]

WILLIAM BEDELL

1571-1642

If the Churches in Italy and Spaine be true Churches for holding all necessary truth, then the Pope and Court of Rome also. Or the Pope and Court are not assemblies of Pastors and sheepe (which is the Genus as it were in the description of the Church) but a certaine confederacy of men seeking themselves and their owne glory, and yet I dare not say that many of the Popish Clergy, being members of the Court, be not also members of the true Church, yea, and saved also.

* * * * *

I would faine heare a definition of a visible Church that might exclude a Popish Church, and leave still Lutheran Churches; yea leave Christ any visible Church on Earth for some ages. If this may be given I could be well content to goe as farre in the casting out the Papisticall assemblyes as another man. In the meane tyme wheresoever saving truth in an outward assembly and pro-

[1] Izaak Walton, "Lives," p. 79.

fession calles men to God there I account is a visible Church.[1]

Writing from Venice to Adam Newton, Jan. 1, 1607/8:

What a disproportion it is to come from ours (our Churches) soe unhonestly kept (for in Buildings we generally goe beyond them) to the glittering Churches and monasteries of Italy, you may easily discerne. Truly, Sir, I have heard some wise men account this as noe small cause of the perversion of soe many of our young Gentlemen that come into these parts.

WILLIAM LAUD (ARCHBISHOP)
1573-1645

Now, to the Romanist I shall say this:—The errors of the Church of Rome are grown now, many of them, very old; and when errors are grown by age and continuance to strength, they which speak for the truth, though it be far older, are ordinarily challenged for the bringers in of "new opinions." And there is no greater absurdity stirring this day in Christendom than that the reformation of an old corrupted Church, will we nill we, must be taken for the building of a new. And were not this so, we should never be troubled with that idle and impertinent question of theirs: "Where was your Church before Luther?" for it was just there, where theirs is now. One and the same Church still, no doubt of that; one in substance, but not one in condition of state and purity: their part of the same Church remaining in corruption, and our part of the same Church under reformation.[2]

We and our adversaries consent, that there is salvation to some in the Roman Church. What! would you have us as malicious—at least, as rash—as yourselves are to us, and deny you so much as possibility of salvation? If we should, we might make you in some things strain for a

[1] Letter to Dr. Samuel Ward, Head of Emmanuel, Cambridge, February 17, 1618/9.

[2] "Epistle Dedicatory to Conference with Fisher," vol. ii., p. 13.

proof; " but we have not so learned Christ," as either to return evil for evil in this heady course, or to deny salvation to some ignorant, silly souls, whose humble peaceable obedience makes them safe among any part of men that profess the foundation, Christ; and therefore seek not to help our cause by denying this comfort to silly Christians, as you most fiercely do, where you can come to work upon them.[1]

We confess as well as you, that out of the Catholic Church of Christ there is no salvation. But what do you mean, by " out of the Church ?" Sure, out of the Roman Church. Why, but the Roman Church and the Church of England are but two distinct members of that Catholic Church which is spread over the face of the earth. Therefore Rome is not the house where the Church dwells; but Rome itself, as well as other particular churches, dwells in this great universal house—unless you will shut up the Church in Rome, as the Donatists did in Africa. I come a little lower. Rome and other national Churches are in this universal catholic house as so many daughters, to whom, under Christ, the care of the household is committed by God the Father, and the Catholic Church the mother of all Christians. Rome, as an elder sister, but not the eldest neither, had a great care committed unto her, in and from the prime times of the Church and to her bishop in her; but at this time (to let pass many brawls that have formerly been in the house) England and some other sisters of hers are fallen out in the family. What then ? Will the Father and the Mother, God and the Church, cast one child out, because another is angry with it ? Or when did Christ give that power to an elder sister, that she, and her steward the bishop there, should thrust out what child she pleased ?—especially when she herself is justly accused to have given the offence that is taken in the house ? Or will not both Father and Mother be sharper to her for this unjust and unnatural usage of her younger sisters, but their dear children ? Nay, is it not the next way to make them

[1] "Conference with Fisher," vol. ii., p. 319.

turn her out of doors, that is so unnatural to the rest? It is well for all Christian men and Churches, that the Father and Mother of them are not so cursed as some would have them. And salvation need not be feared of any dutiful child, nor outing from the Church, because this elder sister's faults are discovered in the house, and she grown froward for it against them that complained.[1]

If the Roman Church will neither reform, nor suffer reformation, it is lawful for any other particular Church to reform itself, so long as it doth it peaceably and orderly, and keeps itself to the foundation, and free from sacrilege.[2]

JOSEPH HALL
1574-1656

There is no other difference between us and Rome than betwixt a Church miserably corrupted, and happily purged.[3]

Be it known to all the world, that our Church is only reformed or repaired, not made new; there is not one stone of a new foundation laid by us; yea, the old walls stand still, only the overcasting of those ancient stones with the untempered mortar of new inventions displeaseth us: plainly, set aside the corruptions, and the Church is the same. And what are these corruptions, but unsound adjectives to the ancient structure of religion? . . . Hence it is that ours is by the opposite styled an Ablative or Negative religion; for so much as we join with all true Christians in all affirmative positions of ancient faith, only standing on the denial of some late and under additaments to the Christian belief.[4]

The Church of Rome hath beene ancient, not the errors; neither doe we in ought differ from it, wherein it is not departed from itself.[5]

[1] "Conference with Fisher," vol. ii., pp. 346-348.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 174.
[3] Adv. to the Reader, "The Old Religion," repeated in "No Peace with Rome."
[4] "The Old Religion." [5] "A Serious Disswasive," p. 614.

What can you plead yet more for your change? Their numbers perhaps, and our handfuls? You heard all the World was theirs, scarce any corner ours: how could you but suspect a few? These are but idle brags; we dare and can share equally with them in Christendome: And if we could not; this rule will teach you to advance Turcisme above Christianity, and Paganisme above that: the World above the Church, Hell above Heaven: If any proofe can be drawne from numbers, He that knowes all, sayes the best are fewest.[1]

A Religion, whose fooleries very boyes may shout and laugh at, if for no more but this, that it teaches men to put confidence in Beades, Medals, Roses, hallowed Swords, Spels of the Gospell, Agnos Dei, and such like idle bawbles, ascribing unto them Divine vertue, etc.[2]

That which Rome holds with us, makes it a Church; That which it obtrudes upon us, makes it hereticall; The truth of principles makes it one, the error and impiety of additions makes it irreconcileable.[3]

He proceeds with his task to "teach how vaine it is to hope that a true, holy, and safe peace can be either had or maintained with our present Romanists; whether we regard the averse and stubborne disposition of the one side or the nature of the matters controverted, or lastly, the impossibility of those meanes, whereby any reconciliation may bee wrought.[4]

JOHN DAVENANT

1576-1641

LETTER TO BISHOP HALL, JANUARY 30, 1628

The being of a Church does principally stand upon the gracious action of God, calling men out of darkness and death unto the participation of light and life in Christ Jesus. So long as God continues this calling unto any

[1] "A Serious Disswasive," p. 620. [2] *Ibid.*
[3] "No Peace with Rome," Sect. i., p. 634.
[4] *Ibid.*, Sect. ii., p. 636. In the following sections he is the reverse of conciliatory.

people, though they as much as in them lies, darken this light, and corrupt the means which should bring them to light and salvation in Christ; yet, when God calls men unto the participation of life in Christ by the word and by the sacrament, there is the true being of a Christian Church, let men be never so false in their exposition of God's word, or never so untrusty in mingling their own traditions with God's ordinances. . . . Thus, to grant that the Roman was, and is, a true visible Christian Church, though in doctrine a false, and in practice an idolatrous Church, is a true assertion; and of greater use and necessity in our controversy with Papists about the perpetuity of the Christian Church, than is understood by those who gainsay it.[1]

RICHARD MONTAGUE

1577-1641

He maintained:

1. That the present Roman Church is neither the Catholic Church nor a sound branch of the Catholic Church.
2. That the present English Church is a sound branch.
3. That none of the points which Rome maintained against Canterbury were Catholic.

He admitted:

1. The Pope was not Antichrist.
2. That Rome had erred in matters of faith, but not in fundamentals.
3. That invocation of Saints, with safeguards, was permissible.

JAMES USHER, ARCHBISHOP OF ARMAGH

1581-1656

The Pope Antichrist:

Q. Is it likely the Lord would have so many Nations that lived under Antichrist, and that so long from the meanes of Salvation ?

[1] Quoted in Page's edition of Burnet's "XXXIX Articles," p. 243.

A. Why not ? and that most justly. For if the whole world of the Gentiles were rejected, when the Church was only in Jury, for some 1,500 years; and seeing even of the Jewes ten Tribes were rejected, and of the remainder, but a few were of the Church; with great reason might the Lord reject those nations and people for so many ages; seeing they rejected God's grace in falling away from the Gospel, which the Lord most graciously revealed unto them, rather than unto their Fathers before them.

After many more terrible questions and answers:

Q. Is it then impossible for a Pope to be saved ?

A. No; it is not impossible, his sin being not necessarily against the Holy Ghost, to which onely repentance is denied. For some (in likelyhood) have entred into, and continued in that See ignorantly; and therefore may possibly find place to repentance. But if any be saved, it is a secret hidden with God; for concerning any thing that appeares by the end of any Pope, since he was lift up in the Emperours chair, and discovered to be the man of sin, there is no grounded hope given to perswade that any one of them is saved.

After many more questions and answers this one on Popish Miracles may be transcribed:

Seeing the Pope's Kingdome glorieth so much in wonders, it is most like that he is Antichrist: seeing the false Christs and the false Prophets shall doe great wonders to deceive (if it were possible) the very Elect, and that some of the false Prophets Prophesies shall come to passe: we should not therefore beleeve the doctrine of Popery for their wonders sake, seeing thereby the Lord tryeth our faith; who hath given to Satan great knowledge and power to work strang things, to bring those to damnation who are appointed unto it, etc. etc.[1]

[1] "The Summe and Substance of Christian Religion," Fourth Edition, 1651, pp. 438-444.

JOHN SELDEN
1584-1654

We charge the Prelatical Clergy with Popery to make them odious, though we know they are guilty of no such thing: Just as heretofore they called Images Mammets, and the Adoration of Images Mammettry: that is, Mahomet and Mahometry, odious names, when all the World knows the Turks are forbidden Images by their Religion.[1]

These Puritan Preachers if they have any things good, they have it out of Popish Books, though they will not acknowledge it, for fear of displeasing the people; he is a poor Divine that cannot sever the good from the bad.[2]

The Jesuits and the Lawyers of France, and the Low-Country-men have engrossed all learning. The rest of the world make nothing but Homilies.[3]

Without School-Divinity a Divine knows nothing logically, nor will be able to satisfy a rational man out of the pulpit.[4]

The Papists call our Religion a Parliamentary religion, but there was once, I am sure, a Parliamentary Pope. Pope Urban was made Pope in England by Act of Parliament, against Pope Clement; the Act is not in the Book of Statutes, either because he that compiled the Book, would not have the Name of the Pope there, or else he would not let it appear that they medled with any such thing, but 'tis upon the Rolls.[5]

JOHN HALES
1584-1656

The plea of the Protestants concerning the corruption of the Church of Rome, which by them is confessed sometimes to have been pure, is no more prejudicial

[1] "Table Talk," p. 88.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 30.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 67.
[4] *Ibid.*, p. 73.
[5] *Ibid.*, p. 87. Edition Arber's Reprints.

to Christ's promise to His Church, "That the gates of hell shall not prevail against her," than the known corruption of the Churches in Asia, in St. John's time, or of other Churches after.[1]

ROBERT SANDERSON
1587-1663

Marrying with a Recusant. He enquires:

Thirdly, what measure of understanding the young person, who is, you say, of great abilities for his age, hath in the fundamental Articles of the Christian Religion: those I mean, wherein the English and Romish Churches are at agreement; for in those the substance of Christianity consisteth. He that rightly understands those Catholic Truths taught in the Catechisms of both Churches, and concerning which all Christendom, in a manner, are at perfect accord, and then will but suffer himself to consider that the Church of England doth not impose upon the judgments and consciences of her members any thing to be believed or received, as of necessity to Salvation, than what is truly Catholic, and by her adversaries confessed so to be; and consequently, that the difference betwixt her and the Romish Party, is wholly about those additionals or superstructures, which they of the Roman faith require to be believed and received with like necessity as the former, but appear to us of this Church respectively, either evidently false, or of doubtful truth, or not of absolute necessity to be believed: I say, whosoever well considereth this, may rest satisfied in his judgment and conscience, that the Faith taught and professed in the Church of England, is a plain and safe way to lead a Christian Believer to Eternal Salvation, if he withal lead his life and conversation answerable thereunto.[2]

[1] "Works," vol. i., pp. 111-112 (Foulis edition).
[2] *Ibid.* (Jacobson's edition), vol. v., p. 79.

SIR GEORGE RADCLIFFE

1593-1657

I am of those that earnestly wish, and would endeavour to my power, the peace of the Catholic Church. (1) To see how nere wee can agree in belief. (2) Where agreement in opinions and tenets cannot yet be had, yet neverthelesse there might be externall peace, and agreement in affections: and some remission on both sides of the rigourous urginge of those thinges which, beinge of ecclesiasticall constitution, made a great discussion between the parties; I am much against punishinge peacible and vertuous men, onely for this opinion or belief. The great wall of seperation, I take to be the infallibility of the Church (the proper subject whereof I could never yet learne from them): this, Hugh Cressy and some of the Sorbon do now seeme to deny, and to substitute authority for infallibilty: if they could make their opinions good, and draw the rest of their communion to the same minds, I could freely pardon H. Cressy all his other faults. In Italie, you will finde the authority of councells deified, and made as infallible as the Apostles. It were good to observe, if there be not some free spirits (especially at Venice) who will be content to examine the subject and foundation of their infallibilty.[1]

JOHN BRAMHALL

1594-1665

I say, when all this shall be cleared, and the schism is brought home and laid at the right door, then we may safely conclude, that by how much we should turn more Roman than we are (whilst things continue in the same condition) by so much we should render ourselves less Catholic.[2]

[1] Letter to Dr. Basire, 1648. Darnell, "Life and Correspondence of Dr. Basire," p. 69.

[2] "Vindication of Church of England," as quoted by Dr. Figgis.

If he (the Bishop of Chalcedon) stand to this ground, there are no more controversies between him and me for the future but this one, what is the true Catholic Church; whether the Church of Rome alone with all its dependents or the Church of the whole world, Roman, Grecian, Armenian, Abyssene, Russian, Protestant, which after all their brags of amplitude and universality is three times greater than themselves. I desire no fairer issue between him and me. I do from my heart submit to all things, which the true Catholic Church diffused over the world doth believe and practise. And if I should err in my judgment what the Catholic Church is (as I am confident that he and his fellows do err), though I have no reason in the world to suspect my present judgment, I do furthermore profess my readiness to submit to the right Catholic Church, whensoever God shall be pleased to reveal it to me. This is sufficient to preserve me from being a schismatic; this is sufficient for the salvation of a Christian.

He telleth us indeed sometimes, that the Roman Church is the 'true Catholic Church,' and is 'diffused all over the world.' Let him take "Roman" in the largest sense he can, yet still it is but a particular Church of one denomination, not Catholic or universal. Whom have they of their communion in the large Abyssene empire, consisting of seventeen kingdoms? Not one. Whom have they of their communion in the Russian empire nearer home? Scarcely one. Whom have they of their communion in all the Eastern Churches? Perhaps two or three handfulls, in comparison of those innumerable multitudes of Christians, who are subject to the other Patriarchs.

Before they were so forward and positive in voting for themselves, that they are the Catholic Church, that they are the infallible judge, it had been meet that they had first agreed among themselves what this Catholic Church is, to which every Christian is bound to submit: whether it be the 'virtual' Church, that is, the Pope, or the Pope jointly with his conclave of Cardinals, or the Pope with a provincial Council; or the Pope with a general Council, that is, the 'representative' Church; or a general

Council without the Pope; or, lastly, the 'essential' Church, dispersed over the face of the world: for into so many opinions they are divided.[1]

JOHN COSIN

1594-1672

Those which make so perilous a matter of our retaining these ceremonies, common to us with the Church of Rome, do seem to imagine that we have of late erected a frame of some new religion, the furniture whereof we should not have borrowed from our enemies, lest they relieving us, might afterward laugh and gibe at our poverty; whereas, in truth we have continued the old religion, and the ceremonies which we have taken from them that were before us are not things that belong to this or that sect, but they are the ancient rites and customs of the Church of Christ, whereof ourselves being a part, we have the self-same interest in them which our fathers before us had, from whom the same descended unto us.[2]

In his last will and testament, he professes his faith in the Creed, his loyalty to the Church, his abhorrence of heretics and schismatics and especially of Presbyterians and Independents. He proceeds:

Quinetiam a corruptelis et ineptis nuperque natis sive papisticis (quas vocant) superstitionibus, doctrinis, et assumentis novis, in avitam ac primævam laudatissimæ olim tam orthodoxæ et Catholicæ Ecclesiæ religionem ac Fidem, jamdudum contra Sacram Scripturam veterumque Patrum regulas ac mores, introductis, me prorsus jam alienum esse, atque adeo a juventute mea semper fuisse, sancte et animitus adsevero.[3]

Cosin was more inclined to minimize the difference between England and Rome in his earlier days.

[1] A Replication, "Works," vol. ii., pp. 211-212.
[2] "Works," vol. v., p. 13.
[3] *Ibid.*, vol. iv., p. 523.

SHELDON

1598-1650

ARCHBISHOP GILBERT SHELDON AND BISHOP PRIDEAUX

Sheldon, reading his "exercise" for a theological degree in 1628 at Oxford, denied that the Pope was Antichrist. Prideaux, "the doctor of the chair," wondering at it, said, Quid, mi fili, negas Papam esse Antichristum? Sheldon answered, Etiam nego. Dr. Prideaux replied, Profecto multum tibi debet Pontifex Romanus, et nullus dubito quin pileo cardinalitio te donabit![1]

HERBERT THORNDIKE

1598-1672

What condition we fall into, if we submit to the Church of Rome upon terms of conquest, it is manifest enough. For wherein the Pope hath not limited his own authority by the Council of Trent, we render ourselves to the mercy of it. The missionaries shall have done a great effect, if they persuade us, that we are schismatics, unless we return to those abuses, which we see with our eyes, which we handle with our hands, they are so evident and so gross. Well may they persuade simple Christians, that they must first resolve, which is the true Church; and then what is true and what is false in religion, by that, which the Church so resolved teaches. This is a great deal the shorter way, than to justify the particulars, which by this means they impose upon them. And if we render ourselves upon these terms, what remains, but that we admit whatsoever the Pope shall impose for the future; though we know, that the power of the whole Church extends not to it? Which how shall we answer at the day of judgment, either for ourselves, or those that depend upon us? And yet I have shewed, that the Church of Rome hath, and

[1] Todd, "Life of Brian Walton," vol. i., p. 291 (quoted by Dr. Pullan in his Bampton Lectures).

NORWICH PUBLIC LIBRARIES

ought to have, when it shall please to hear reason, a regular pre-eminence over the rest of Christendom in these western parts. And he, that is able to judge, and willing to consider, shall find that pre-eminence the only reasonable means to preserve so great a body in unity. And, therefore, I count not myself tied to justify Henry the Eight in disclaiming all such pre-eminence; when it was enough for his purpose to disown it as not extending to his case. For by the regular constitution of the Church, which I have described, if the Pope excommunicate any man unjustly, he does it in his own wrong; he excommunicates himself thereby from all, that shall adhere to him, whom he excommunicates. His advantage is only this,—if more adhere to the chief Church than to the less. For which though there be regularly a presumption; yet, if usurpation appear, either in sentencing, or in the matter, or in the effect of the sentence, he, that exceeds his authority, breaks it upon him, that exceeds not: like the waves of the sea against a rock.[1]

WILLIAM CHILLINGWORTH

1602-1644

Although it were granted schism to leave the external communion of the visible Church, in what state or case soever it be, and that Luther and his followers were schismatics for leaving the external communion of all visible Churches; yet you fail exceedingly of clearing the other necessary point undertaken by you, "that the Roman Church was then the visible Church." For neither do Protestants (as you mistake) "make the true preaching of the word, and due administration of the sacraments, the notes of the visible Church," but only of a visible Church: now these, you know, are very different things; the former signifying the Church Catholic, or the whole Church; the latter, a particular Church, or a part of the Catholic. And therefore, suppose out of courtesy we

[1] Just Weights and Measures, "Works," vol. v., p. 124.

should grant, what by argument you can never evince, that your Church has these notes, yet would it by no means follow, that your Church were the visible Church, but only a visible Church; not the whole catholic, but only a part of it . . .

Lastly, whereas you say, "that Protestants must either grant that your Church then was the visible Church, or name some other, disagreeing from yours, and agreeing with Protestants in their particular doctrine, or acknowledge there was no visible Church:" it is all one, as if (to use St. Paul's similitude) the head should say to the foot, either you must grant that I am the whole body, or name some other member that is so, or confess that there is no body. To which the foot may answer, I acknowledge there is a body; and yet, that no member beside you is this body; nor yet that you are it, but only a part of it. And in like manner say we, We acknowledge a Church there was, corrupted indeed universally, but yet such a one as we hope by God's gracious acceptance was still a Church. We pretend not to name any one society that was this Church; and yet we see no reason that can enforce us to confess that yours was the Church, but only a part of it, and that one of the worst then extant in the world. In vain therefore have you troubled yourself in proving that we "cannot pretend, that either the Greeks, Waldenses, Wickliffites, Hussites, Muscovites, Armenians, Georgians, Abyssines, were then the visible Church." For all this discourse proceeds upon a false and vain supposition, and begs another point in question between us, which is, that some Church of one denomination and one communion (as the Roman, the Greek, etc.) must be always, exclusively to all other communions, the whole visible Church.[1]

[1] "Works" (Oxford, 1838), vol. ii., pp. 186-188. Chillingworth was (1) an Arminian, (2) a Papist, (3) a Latitudinarian. These quotations represent his latest views. The Catholic Church was really, though he does not admit it *totidem verbis*, for him invisible, or perhaps the sum total of all visible Churches.

SIR KENELM DIGBY

1603-1665

I am so free from partiality that I will confess plainly, I doubt many errors have crept in among us (R. Cs.), principally by two causes; the one is that many barbarous nations did overrun the parts where the true faith was professed, and that they plucked up learning as it were by the roots; in the next age, in the infancy of the recovery of it, some men with an ignorant and unlearned zeal, taught such erroneous doctrine, as since the best wits and greatest scholars, do strive to defend out of reverence to antiquity: and the other is, that now of late, since the separation of the Churches, there has been so much way given to the bitterness of passion, and the spirit of contradiction hath prevailed so much, that some of the most learned men have stretched some tenets beyond what, I think, themselves believed.[1]

HERBERT CROFT

1603-1691

Writing 1675:

Our Church is more and more divided; such is the perverse nature of man, *Niti in Vetitum*, obstinately to oppose Authority, especially when they can pretend the colour of Religion and Conscience; this carries so great an applause among the Vulgar (still envious at Superiors) that it is, as it were, Nuts to an Ape, sweeter to them than any other thing this world affords: for the enjoyment of this they will endure any thing, imprisonment, loss of goods, yea sometime of life also. And this is it which mainly nourishes our Divisions, gives great advantage to the growth of Popery, and threatens the total ruine of our Church. Many who were formerly very zealous for our Church, seeing these our sad divisions, and not

[1] "Memoirs," p. 179.

seeing those of the Roman Church, nor their gross Superstitions (which their Priests conceal till they have got men fast) are easily seduced by their pretended Unity, and daily fall from us.[1]

HENRY HAMMOND

1605-1660

In his " Practical Catechism " there is no Roman controversy except Book II., Section XI., where he speaks of the Pope's two swords and claim to temporal power. He writes, our Lord " gave no Sword but only Keys to Peter, and most sharply reprehended him for using the Sword, though against the apprehenders of Christ himself." He points out that as Vicar of Christ, the Pope could not claim temporal power, for our Lord claimed none. He then notes how one Roman controversialist calls him Vicedeum, Papam vicarium immortalis Dei (Rodericus Zamorensis). This, he says, would constitute him Antichrist.

In his work on Schism he writes:

And if it be now demanded whether there were not anciently some *summum genus*, some one supreme either of, or over these patriarchs, I answer, that if we respect order, or priority of place again, then the Bishop of Rome had it among the patriarchs, as the patriarchs among the primates, that city of Rome being lady of the world, and the seat of the Empire; but if we respect power or authority, there was none anciently in the Church over that of primates or patriarchs, but only that of the Emperor in the whole Christian world, as of every sovereign prince in his dominions, as may appear by the ancient power and practice of congregating or convoking of councils.[2]

We exclude no Christian from our communion that will either filially or fraternally embrace it with us, being ready to admit any of our assemblies that acknowledge the foundation laid by Christ and His Apostles, so we as

[1] " Naked Truth," p. 1 (Henson's reprint).
[2] Of Schism, " Works," vol. ii., p. 227.

earnestly desire to be admitted to the like freedom of external communion with all the members of all other Christian Churches, as oft as occasion makes us capable of that blessing of the one heart and one lip, and would most willingly, by the use of the ancient method of *literæ communicatoriæ*, maintain this communion with those with whom we cannot corporally assemble, and particularly with those which live in obedience to the Church of Rome.[1]

If . . . we shall still by unrelenting adversaries be censured and condemned as heretics—and upon that account cast out as refuse branches and unchurched members, and so that unity and communion which Christ hath commanded to continue among His disciples, become unattainable by us—herein we complain of great unkindness and injustice in the Church of Rome, and in those that join and adhere to her in that sentence, which by papal bull was long since sent out against us; and upon these premised grounds we resolve still to retain that degree of charity to our most implacable enemies as to pray for them, and to admonish them of the eminent danger of their uncharitableness, in case those hindrances be not upon due judgment removed on their part, which obstruct the union and peace of Christendom. It being most unreasonable, that among them which communicate in every branch of the one apostolical faith, that sacred band should yet be violated, upon vain and empty pretences of diversities of opinion or usages in such matters, which are far removed from the great foundation of apostolical doctrines and practices, or which are not sufficiently testified to come from them who yet are justly presumable to have delivered carefully, and appointed the Church to preserve faithfully through all ages, all those things which are fundamentally necessary for a Christian to believe or practise to his soul's health.[2]

[1] Of Schism, " Works," vol. ii., p. 283.
[2] A Parænesis, " Works," vol. ii., p. 378.

SIR THOMAS BROWNE
1605-1682

The Church of England; to whose Faith I am a sworn subject, and therefore in a double obligation subscribe unto her Articles, and endeavour to observe her Constitutions. Whatsoever is beyond, as points indifferent, I observe according to the rules of my private reason, or the humour and fashion of my devotion; neither believing this, because Luther affirmed it, or disproving that, because Calvin hath disavouched it. I condemn not all things in the Council of Trent, nor approve all in the Synod of Dort. In brief, where the scripture is silent, the Church is my Text; where that speaks, 'tis but my Comment: where there is a joynt silence of both, I borrow not the rules of my religion from Rome or Geneva, but the dictates of my own reason.[1]

ROBERT LEIGHTON
1611-1684

How impertinent then is that question so much tossed by the Romish Church, " How know you the Scriptures (say they) to be the word of God, without the testimony of the Church ?" I would ask one of them again, How they can know that it is daylight, except some light a candle to let them see it ?[2]

JEREMY TAYLOR
1613-1667

In his " Dissuasive from Popery " addressed to the Irish, he proves that the distinctive doctrines of Rome are neither primitive nor Catholic, (2) he maintains that much of

[1] " Religio Medici," section v., p. 11.
[2] " Sermons," vol. iii., p. 63.

their teaching results in an evil life, (3) and much is anti-social and a danger to human governments and especially to Monarchy. In the second part, which is in two books, he deals with ordinary subjects in the controversy. Book I is concerned with the Church and its authority. Book II is concerned with Indulgences, Purgatory, Transubstantiation, Communion in one kind, Prayers in an unknown tongue and the worship of Images.

I will only quote from a letter which he wrote to a lady who had joined the Roman Communion, signing himself "your very affectionate friend and servant."[1]

"You are now gone to a Church that protects itself by arts of subtilty and arms, by violence, and persecuting all that are not of their minds, to a Church in which you are to be a subject of the King so long as it pleases the Pope: in which you may be absolved from your vows made to God, your oaths to the King, your promises to men, your duty to your parents in some cases: a Church in which men pray to God, and to saints in the same form of words in which they pray to God . . . a Church in which men are taught by most of the principal leaders to worship images with the same worship with which they worship God and Christ, or him or her whose image it is, and in which they usually picture God the Father and the Holy Trinity.[2]

"You are gone to a Church that pretends to be infallible, and yet is infinitely deceived in many particulars, and yet endures no contradiction, and is impatient her children should enquire into anything her Priests obtrude. (If the Church is infallible ought she to permit contradiction ?) You are gone from receiving the whole sacrament to receive it but half; from Christ's institution to a human invention, from scripture to uncertain traditions, and from ancient traditions to new pretences, from prayers which ye understood to prayers which ye understand not,

[1] "Works," vol. vi., p. 648. (Eden's Edition.)

[2] In his "Dissuasive" he quotes authorities for these statements. They are not always quite conclusive; and even if correct they do not always represent Roman theology at its best.

from confidence in God to rely upon creatures, from entire dependence upon inward acts to a dangerous temptation of resting too much in outward ministries, in the external work of sacraments and of sacramentals. You are gone from a Church whose worshipping is simple, christian and apostolical, to a Church where men's consciences are loaden with a burden of ceremonies greater than that in the days of the Jewish religion. . . . You are gone from a Church where you were exhorted to read the word of God, the holy scriptures . . . to a Church that seals up that fountain from you, and gives you drink by drops out of such cisterns as they first make, and then stain, and then reach out. . . . You are gone from us, where you were only taught to worship God through Jesus Christ, and now you are taught to worship saints and angels with a worship at least dangerous, and in some things proper to God.[1]

NATHANAEL CULVERWEL

1617 ?-1651 ?

Anti-christ hath endeavoured to be the Abaddon and the Apollyon of all sacred Antiquities, though the very Reliques of those shining and burning Lights, that adorn'd the Church of God, have splendour enough to scatter the darkness of Popery, that empty shadow of Religion, that arises *ob defectum Luminis:* yet Antiquity (setting aside those that were peculiarly *Θεόπνευστοι*)—was but the first dawning of Light, which was to shine out brighter and brighter till perfect day. Let none therefore so superstitiously look back to former ages as to be angry with new Opinions and displayings of Light, either in Reason or Religion. . . . But I know there are some will tell us of a visible Tribunal, of an infallible Head

[1] This, of course, is only a private letter, and is not a fair specimen of Roman controversy. J. T. was learned and very eloquent, but not a great reasoner nor always even persuasive. We can imagine that his "affectionate friend" was much reassured after showing the letter to her Confessor.

of the Church, born to determine all controversies, to regulate all Men, 'tis a wonder they do not say Angels too; others more prudently and equally resolve the final judgment of Controversies into a general and Œcumenical Councel: but I shall speak to them all in the language of the Philosopher, *Δεῖ τὸν νόμον ἄρχειν πάντων* and I shall explain it according to the minde of the learned Davenant in his Discourse *De Iudice ac norma fidei et cultus Christiani*. God onely is to rule his own Church *αὐτοκρατικῶς καὶ νομοθετικῶς, judicio auctoritativo*, by a determining and Legislative power: men, that are fitted by God himself, are to guide and direct it *ὑπηρετικῶς καὶ Ερμηνευτικῶς iudicio ministeriali* in way of subserviency to him, by an explication of his mind; yet so as that every one may judge of this *ἰδιωτικῶς καὶ ἀκροατικῶς iudicio privato et practicæ discretionis*, by acts of their own understanding illuminated by the spirit of God; for there are no representatives in Intellectuals and Spirituals.[1]

JOHN EVELYN

1620-1706

The Council of Trent, which, imposing no fewer than eleven new Articles; some of them notoriously false, others of matter disputable, under pain of damnation to those who could not swallow them; cut off all terms of that Reformation, which all Christendom loudly called for; and, adding those Articles to the Athanasian Symbol, transferred the concluding anathema thereof to the foot of their monstrous doctrine: all this by a cabal of the Popes, and contrary to the endeavours and protestations of the most learned doctors, princes, and others, who had their representatives in that assembly, as is made out plainly by the modest writers and most impartial historians of their own communion. So that this Council's decrees may be justly reckoned among the most

[1] "Light of Nature," p. 309. *Vide* Campagnac's edition of "Cambridge Platonists."

dangerous heresies that ever appeared in the Christian Church.[1]

There was even in the Church of Rome still the matter, but not the form, of a visible Church. Now, it is not the matter, but the form (we know) that gives the ease and being to things. The persons are the matter who compose the Church, and they indeed are visible; but it is not that which gives the denomination, without the other. Now, all who profess the Christian religion may be called the matter, and yet be exceedingly wide from being a true Church. When the form is visible, it is then, and then only, the true Church will be so too. Now, the form consists in faith, godliness, sanctity, and things which do not (of their natures) so evidently appear and make external and pharisaical shows to the eyes of the world, because they are graces hidden in the hearts of believers, and fall not so properly under the criterion of sense.[2]

ISAAC BARROW

1630-1677

That God did intend his Church should perpetually subsist united in any one political frame of government, is a principle which they do assume and build upon, but can nowise prove. Nor indeed is it true. For if the unity of the Church designed and instituted by God were only an unity of faith, of charity, of peace, of fraternal communion and correspondence between particular societies and pastors, then in vain it is to seek for the subject and seat of universal jurisdiction.[3]

Upon this very account, the Romish pretence doth not well accord with holy scripture, because it transformeth the Church into another kind of body than it was constituted by God, according to the representation of it in scripture: for there it is represented as a spiritual

[1] "History of Religion," vol. ii., pp. 247-248.
[2] *Ibid.*, vol. ii., p. 318.
[3] "A Treatise of the Pope's Supremacy," p. 72.

and heavenly society, compacted by the bands of one faith, one hope, one spirit of charity; but this pretence turneth it into a worldly frame; united by the same bands of interest and design; managed in the same manner, by terror and allurement; supported by the same props of force, of policy, of wealth, of reputation and splendour, as all other secular corporations are. You may call it what you please; but it is evident, that in truth the papal monarchy is a temporal dominion, driving on worldly ends by worldly means.[1]

Whereas now Christendom is split into many parcels, subject to divers civil sovereignties, it is expedient that correspondently there should be distinct ecclesiastical governments, independent of each other, which may comply with the respective civil authorities in promoting the good and peace both of Church and State. It is fit that every prince should, in all things, govern all his subjects.[2]

GEORGE BULL

1634-1710

As for that undertaking of your ladyship (which he mentions), "to make appear our Church to be the only true Church," etc., knowing your ladyship's wisdom and prudence, I cannot believe you ever undertook any such thing. None of us do affirm that our Church is the only true Church; for that would be a schismatical assertion, like that of the Donatists of old, and the papists nowadays, and the highest breach of charity, in damning all the Christian world besides ourselves. What we affirm is this, that our Church is a true Church, in all the respects mentioned by the author of the letter, and also a pure Church; and therefore such, as from which no man can separate, or desert her communion, without the guilt of schism.[3]

[1] "A Treatise of the Pope's Supremacy," p. 86.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 102.
[3] Vindication of the Church of England in a letter to the Countess of Newburgh. "Works," Burton's edition, vol. ii., p. 188.

We maintain, that our Church, and the pastors thereof, did always acknowledge the same rule of faith, the same fundamental articles of the Christian religion, both before and since the Reformation; but with this difference, that we then professed the rule of faith together with the additional corruptions of the Church of Rome; but now (God be thanked) without them.[1]

Where was your Church before Luther? To which the answer is easy: Our Church was then where it is now, even here in England. She hath not changed one thing of what she held before, any way pertaining either to the being or well-being of a Church; only she hath made an alteration in some things, which seemed to her (and so they will to all indifferent judges) greatly prejudicial to both. She still retains the same common rule of faith. She still teacheth the necessity of a holy life, and presseth good works as much as before; only she is grown more humble, and dares not ascribe any merit to them. She still observes all the fundamental ordinances and institutions of Christianity. She baptizeth, she feeds with the holy Eucharist, she confirmeth. She retaineth the same apostolical government of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons. And because she finds that a set form of Liturgy is used by all Christian Churches in the world, without any known beginning, she hath hers too, and that a grave, solemn, excellently composed one, conformed, as near as she could devise, to the pattern of the most ancient offices. A Liturgy, for its innocence and purity, so beyond all just exceptions, that the papists themselves, upon its first establishment, could not but embrace it. And therefore for several years they came to our Churches, joined in our devotions, and communicated without scruple, till at last (as an excellent person of our Church rightly expresseth it) "a temporal interest of the Church of Rome rent the schism wider, and made it gape like the jaws of the grave."[2]

[1] Vindication of the Church of England in a letter to the Countess of Newburgh. "Works," Burton's edition, vol. ii., p. 205.

[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 206-207.

The Nicene Creed.—This Creed they (The Fathers of Trent) judge necessary to be in so many express words professed by their whole assembly, as "the principle wherein all Christians, that profess the faith of Christ, do necessarily agree; and the only firm foundation, against which the gates of hell shall never prevail." Where, when they profess this Creed to be the principle, wherein all Christians do "necessarily agree," they plainly intimate (if we poor Protestants may presume to understand their meaning by their words) that there is no absolute necessity that all Christians should agree in other things.[1]

Ignatius, in Epistolis ad ecclesias Asiaticas conscriptis, istos hæreticos passim perstringit; idem vero, ad Romanos scribens, nullam in illa ecclesia hæresin reprehendit. Imo in ipsa salutatione Romanos diserte laudat ob fidei omnimodam puritatem, dum ipsos dicit *ἡνωμένους ἐν πάσῃ ἐντολῇ Χριστοῦ, πεπληρωμένους χάριτος Θεοῦ ἀδιακρίτως, καὶ ἀποδιϋλισμένους ἀπὸ παντὸς ἀλλοτριόυ χρώματος. i.e.* (Usseriano interprete vertente), "Unitos in omni mandato Christi," "impletos omni gratia Dei indivisim, et abstractos" (vel defæcatos) "ab omni alieno colore." Atque hac præcipue de causa, ut arbitror, ecclesiam Romanam Tertullianus statu "felicem ecclesiam" appellat lib. de Præscript adv. Hæres. cap. 36. Utinam hæc felicitas, hæc fidei puritas ecclesiæ isti perpetua fuisset! sed proh dolor! nunc prophetæ divini verbis exclamare possumus, "Quomodo effecta est meretrix urbs fidelis."[2]

ROBERT SOUTH

1634-1716

SERMON PREACHED IN WESTMINSTER ABBEY, NOVEMBER 5, 1688. (*Note date.*)

Vol. III, p. 265. Were not Protestantism in itself a better religion than Popery, it would have but little advantage from most of the persons who profess it.

[1] Vindication of the Church of England in a letter to the Countess of Newburgh. "Works," Burton's edition, vol. ii., p. 220.
[2] Judicium Ecclesiæ Catholicæ," Works," vol. vii., pp. 97, 98.

266. Declamatory satires may indeed seem useless to all purposes whatsoever; it being impossible to revile away a distemper, or to cure a disease by an invective. But were they never so proper, though the Church of England, whose principles and practices breathe nothing but loyalty to princes, may justify any hard speeches against the sons of Rome, yet surely the Papists are not fit to be reviled by, nor indeed before many amongst us, who have acted worse things, and that with the aggravation of acting them under a better religion; unless it could be fit to arraign one malefactor before another, who is himself a greater. I wish that, while we speak loud against those of the Romish Church, we could at the same time inwardly abhor and detest their impieties, and yet imitate their discretion, and be ashamed that those sons of darkness should be so much wiser in their generation, than we that account ourselves such children of light. For be they what they will, it is evident that they manage things at an higher rate of prudence than to fear a change in their Church government every six months, or to be persuaded by any arguments to cut their throats with their own hands, or, amongst all their indulgences, to afford any to their implacable enemies.

271. But let the doctrine, discipline, and rituals of the Church of England be searched to the bottom by rational and impartial heads, and then let them, if they please, produce any thing justly offensive to a conscience tender not to the degree of rebellion.

273. For the crowns of Spain and of France thrive and flourish, for all the Popish religion settled on these kingdoms; but the sanctified actors of our late confusions were such as tore the crown from the King's head, and his head from his shoulders, and would, upon the same advantages, undoubtedly do the same again. The least finger of fanaticism bearing harder and heavier upon monarchy, than the whole loins of Popery: God deliver us from them both.[1]

[1] "Works," vol. iii. Oxford Edition, 1842.

EDWARD STILLINGFLEET
1635-1699

There are three things mainly in dispute between us, and those of the Church of Rome, viz.: Whether they, or we, give the more satisfactory account of the Grounds of Faith? Whether their Church, or ours, be guilty of the charge of Schism? And, Whether their Church be justly accused by us of introducing many Errours and Superstitions?[1]

In many of the particular Differences, I have made use of several of their late Writers against themselves; both to let them see, how much Popery begins to grow weary of itself; and, how unjustly they condemn us for denying those things, which the moderate and rational men of their own side disown, and dispute against as well as we; and chiefly to undeceive the world, as to their great pretence of unity among themselves. Since their Divisions are grown to so great a height both at home, and in foreign parts, that the dissenting parties mutually charge each other with Heresie, and that about their great Foundation of Faith, viz.: the Pope's Infallibility; the Jansenists in France, and a growing party in England, charging the Jesuits with Heresie in asserting it, as they do them with the same for denying it.[2]

I have not only consulted their greatest Authours, especially the three famous Cardinals, Baronius, Bellarmin, and Perron; but the chiefest of those, who, under the name of Conciliators, have put the fairest varnish on the Doctrine of that Church.[3]

Although we say, that particular Churches may erre, and be corrupt, we do not say, that it is necessary they should always be so. For, in some ages particular Churches may be free from errour and corruption, and yet in another age be overspread with them. And thus we assert it to have been with the Roman Church: for his

[1] Preface to his "Vindication," edition 1665.
[2] *Ibid.*
[3] *Ibid.*

Lordship (Laud) saith, In the prime times it was a most right and orthodox Church, but in the immediate times before Luther, or in some ages before, that it was a corrupt and tainted Church: And so in those times in which it was right, those might be heretical who did not communicate with it, not meerly because they did not communicate with it, but because, in not communicating with a right and orthodox Church, they shewed themselves guilty of some errour or corruption.[1]

WILLIAM BEVERIDGE
1637-1708

Quod primo ad Pontificios spectat, illi, fateor, sese Catholicos vocant, atque ab aliis etiam ita vocari amant. Sed omnium indignissimi sunt qui glorioso isthoc nomine nuncupentur. Illi enim soli Catholici antiquitus appellati sunt, hodieque merito appellari possunt, qui Ecclesiæ Universalis fidem ac disciplinam pie tenent, sancteque observant. At vero Romana ista ecclesia, in cujus fidem moresque Pontificii omnes jurati sunt, tot nova dogmata adinvenit, totque novos ritus Ecclesiæ Universali vel rejectos, vel incognitos nuper instituit, hodieque imperat, ut vix ecclesiæ Christianæ, nisi forsitan corruptissimæ, nedum Catholicæ nomen mereatur. Nihil enim cum Catholica, nihil cum omnibus aliis ecclesiis commune habet, sed omnia potius diversa et contraria, præter ea in quibus cum Anglicana consentit.[2]

DANIEL WHITBY
1638-1726

If this be truly the result of the most specious pretences of the Roman party to draw our souls into their deadly snares, if all their fairest pleas do make for Judaism, more

[1] Preface to his "Vindication," edition 1665, p. 331.

[2] Sermon at opening of Convocation in 1672, Popish Plot time. The preacher goes on to condemn many Popish rites and ceremonies. The title of the sermon is "De Ritibus Ecclesiasticis." It is found in A. C. L., "Works," vol. x., p. 483.

naturally than they do for popery; if what they urge, to prove the Protestant divines to be deceivers of the people, doth more strongly prove our blessed Jesus a deceiver, which is the highest blasphemy; I hope that no true lover of this Jesus will be much tempted by such pleas to entertain a good opinion of the Romish faith: it being certainly that faith, which cannot be established but on the ruins of Christianity, nor embraced by any Protestant, but with the greatest hazard, if not the ruin, of his soul.[1]

GILBERT BURNET

1643-1715

Those of the Church of Rome do teach, that a man born in the Greek Church, or among us, is bound to lay down his error, and his communion too, and to come over to them; and yet they allow our baptism, as well as they do the ordinations of the Greek Church.

Thus they allow private men to judge, and that in so great a point, as what Church and what communion ought to be chosen or forsaken. And it is certain, that to judge of Churches and communions is a thing of that intricacy, that if private judgment is allowed here, there is no reason to deny it its full scope as to all other matters.†

Those who think that it is in general well proved, that there must be an infallibility in the Church, conclude from thence, that it must be in the Pope: for if there must be a living speaking judge always ready to guide the Church, and to decide controversies, they say this cannot be in the diffusive body of Christians; for these cannot meet to judge. Nor can it be in a general council, the meeting of which depends upon so many accidents, and on the consent of so many princes, that the infallibility will lie dormant for some ages, if the general council is the seat of it. Therefore they conclude, that since it is certainly in the Church, and can be nowhere else but in

[1] Sermon on St. John vii., pp. 47-49, Burnet's "XXXIX Articles," p. 237.

[2] "XXXIX Articles," ed. Page, p. 246.

the Pope, therefore it is lodged in the see of Rome. Whereas we, on the other hand, think this is a strong argument against the infallibility in general, that it does not appear in whom it is vested: and we think that every side does so effectually confute the other, that we believe them all as to that; and think they argue much stronger when they prove where it cannot be, than when they pretend to prove where it must be.[1]

WILLIAM WAKE

1657-1737

The account of his correspondence with the Gallicans in 1717 in Perry's "Church History," vol. iii., ch. iii., is very interesting:

"My task is pretty hard, and I scarce know how to manage in this matter. To go any further than I have done, even as a divine of the Church of England, may meet with censure, and, as Archbishop of Canterbury, I cannot treat with these gentlemen. This would only expose me to the censure of doing what, in my station, ought not to be done without the King's knowledge, and it would be very odd for me to have an authoritative permission to treat with those, who have no manner of authority to treat with me. I cannot tell what to say to Dr. Du Pin. If he thinks we are to take their direction, what to retain and what to give up, he is utterly mistaken, I am a friend to peace, but more to truth. And they may depend upon it I shall always account our Church to stand upon an equal foot with theirs; and that we are no more to receive laws from them, than to impose any on them. In short, the Church of England is free, is orthodox. She has a plenary authority within herself, and has no need to recur to any other Church to direct her what to retain and what to do. If they mean to deal with us, they must lay down this for the foundation—that we are to deal with one another on equal terms."[2]

[1] "XXXIX Articles," ed. Page, p. 256.
[2] Perry, pp. 46-47.

NORWICH PUBLIC

INDEX

Abbot, Archbishop, 208
Advertisements of 1566, the, 82, 83
Alcuin, 28
Aldhelm, 27
Alexander II., Pope, 32
Alfred, King of England, 26, 27, 28, 133
All Souls' College, 38
Andrewes, Lancelot (1555-1626), 119, 251
Anglicanism, 47
Anglican Orders, recognition of, 188
Anglo-Catholic, 15
— theology, 43
Anglo-Saxon Church, the. See Church
— education, 133
Annates, 39
Anointing, 63
Apostolicæ Curæ, the Bull, 170
Apostolic succession, **121** *ff.*
Appeals to Rome, 34
Archbishop, liturgical authority of, 76
Archbishops, Answer of the, 170
Articles, the XI., 244
— the XIII., 242
— the XXXIX., 16, 21, 56, 71, 244
— the XLII., 244
— the Irish, 247
Arundel, Archbishop of Canterbury, Constitutions of, 136
Athanasian Creed, the, 51
Atonement, doctrine of the, 59
Augustine, St., Archbishop of Canterbury, 26, 163
— Bishop of Hippo, 7, 115
Authority, 50, 52, 54
— of Bishop, 75
— liturgical, 75

Bancroft, Archbishop, 208
Baptism, 17, 23, 62, 169
Barrow, Isaac, 281
Bede, the Venerable, 27, 28
Bedell, William, 259
Benedict Biscop, 27
Benediction, 103
Benson, Archbishop, 230
— Bishop Martin, 212
Beveridge, William, 122, 287
Bible, the, 52
— translators of the, 246
Binding and loosing, 9
Birkbeck, W. J., 67
Bishop, the, and the cathedral, 206, 217, 229
— dress of the, 87
— liturgical authority of, 75
Bishops, appointment of, 125, 194
Bishops' Book, the (1537), 241
Bishops, successors of Apostles, 13
Boniface, St., Apostle of Germany, 29
Bramhall, Archbishop, 119, 177, 268
Brooke and McLean, the *Octateuch*, 44
Brooks, Bishop, 207
Browne, Bishop Forrest, 219
Browne, Sir Thomas, 277
Bull, George, 282
Bull *Apostolicæ Curæ*, 170
Bullingham, Bishop, 207
Bureaucratic education, 144
Burkitt, *Evangelion Da-Mepharreshe*, 44
Burnet, Gilbert, 288

Cædmon, 28
Calvinism, 183
Cambridge, University of, 134
Campbell, Dr. A. J., 115
Canon Law, 55
— of Communion Service, 108
Canons of 1604, 231, 244, 248
— *of* 1606, 245
Canons, emoluments of, 232
— honorary, 220, 232, 233
— lay, 234
— minor, 234
Canterbury, 27, 133
Canute, King of England, 30
Casaubon, Isaac, 253
Cathedral, position of Bishop, 217, 229

Cathedral finance, 225
— visitation, the, **206** *ff.*
Cathedrals, opening of the, 235
— the use of, 226, 227
Catholic, 15
— revival, the, 196
Celtic Mission, the, 26
Chalcedon, Christology of, 57
Charles I., personal influence, 43
Charter of Foundation, 217
Chasuble, the, 86
Chaucer, Geoffrey, 36, 135
Chester Cathedral, 236
Cheyney, Bishop, 207
Chichele, Henry, Archbishop of Canterbury, 38
Chillingworth, William, 272
Choral celebrations, 88, 92
Christ Church, 38
Church, the, **3** *ff.*
— Anglo-Saxon, 25
— Apostolic, 12, 13
— authority of the, **49** *ff.*, 52
— faith of the, 17
— founded by our Lord, **3** *ff.*
— in history, 13
— invisible, 3
— nature of the, 22
— ministry of, 18
— notes of, 19, 22
— ordinances of the, 17
— an organized society, 112
— theories about, 14, 15
— true theory of the, 20
— undivided, 13
— unity of, 19
— visible, 3, 15, 22
— Orthodox, 15, 20
— Orthodox, and the Church of England, 187
— Orthodox, Rome and the, 165
— of England, 16
— — its claim, 71
— — continuity of the, 44
— — its creed, 55
— — its double origin, 26
— — doctrinal teaching of, **48** *ff.*
— — elements of failure, 204
— — expansion of the, 46
— — Free Evangelical Catholic, 47
— — its history, 25
— — its insularity, 30
— — a learned Church, 197
— — a missionary Church, 29
— — a national Church, 26, 191
— — its organization, **111** *ff.*
— — a Church of the people, 28
— — its relations to Rome, 30
Church of England, teaching as to Sacraments, 65
— — a true Church, 24
— — and the Universities, 199
— — its worship, **70** *ff.*
Church of Rome, the, 14, 19, 20
— — infallibility of, 19, 20
Church, the Swedish, 86
Colet, 42, 138
Communion, 90
— fasting, 100
— of the sick, 101
— Office, revision of, 109
Comprehension, 45, 202
Compulsory education, 141
Confession, 97, 98, 99
Confirmation, 169
— and confession, 99
Congregation, position of the, 126
Congregationalism, 113
Constantine, donation of, 33
Cope, the, 87
Cosin, John, 120, 270
Coulton, *Five Centuries of Religion*, 35
Council, the Fourth Lateran, 55, 64, 135
— the Vatican, 159
— of Florence, the, 55
Councils, authority of, 50
— the seven, 55
Cranmer, Thomas, Archbishop of Canterbury, 38
Creeds, authority of the, 50
Creighton, Mandell, Bishop of London, 38
Croft, Herbert, 274
Cromwell, Thomas, 38
Culverwel, Nathanael, 279
Curia, the Roman, 164
Cuthbert, St., 28
Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage, 126, 177

Dalman, 5, 10
Davenant, John, 263
Davidson, Dr. Randall, Archbishop of Canterbury, 158
Dean, authority of the, 221
— the emoluments of, 232
— the status of, 230
Democratic education, 145
Denmark, English missions in, 30
Digby, Sir Kenelm, 274
Dissenters, forbidden to teach in schools, 140
Divisions of Christendom, 4, 154
Donatist Baptism, 115
Dunstan, St., 28, 31

Ecclesia, 5, 10, 11, 12
Education, Anglo-Saxon, 133
— the Board of, 147
— the Church and, **130** *ff.*, 139
— elementary, 150
— importance of, 130
— mediæval, 134
— in the nineteenth century, 141
— in Russia, 131
— Soviet, 131
Edward VI., King of England, his grammar schools, 138
Egbert, Archbishop of York, 28
Elizabeth, Queen of England, 43, 83, 139
English Church Union, the, 189
— language, use of the, 71
Episcopacy, 113, 115, 181
— constitutional, 125
— its divine institution, 118
— the English Church and, 117
— Lutheran theory of, 179
— monarchical, 12
— representative, 125
— a separate order, 118
— its universality, 116
— value of, 115
Episcopate, the, 127, 161
Erasmus, 42, 138, 197
Esthonia, 179
Eton College, 38
Eucharist, the, 17, 62, 89, 170
— doctrine of the, 169
Evangelical Christianity, 168
— movement, the, 46
Evangelicalism, 16, 77
Evelyn, John, 280
Exeter College, 199

Fabric, Cathedral, 238
Faith, the Christian, 57
Fall, doctrine of the, 168
Fasting, 100
— Communion, 100
Field, Richard, 257
First-fruits and tenths, 138
Fowler, Bishop, 211
Free Church of Scotland, 195
Freedom, 201
— of the Church, 195
— in education, 149
Freehold, the parson's, 45, 202
Frere, Dr. Walter, Bishop of Truro, 30

Gairdner, Dr. James, 39
Gallicanism, 40
Gasquet, Cardinal, 165
Gelasian Sacramentary, 68
Geneva, 185
German criticism, 196
Germany, religious influence of, 184
Gibson, Dr., Bishop of Gloucester, 81, 106
Gloucester Abbey, 38
— school case (1410), 136
Goldsborough, Bishop, 208
Goodman, Bishop, 208
Gore, Bishop Charles, 53, 177
Gregory the Great, 30
Gregory VII., Hildebrand, 32
Grindal, Archbishop, 207
Grocyn, 42, 138

Hadrian, Archbishop of Canterbury, 27
Hailes Abbey, 38
Hales, John, 266
Halifax, Viscount, **158**, 163, 168
Hall, Joseph, 262
Hammond, Henry, 275
Henry III., King of England, 33
Henry VI., King of England, 38
Henry VIII., King of England, his Church policy, 39, 40
— his interest in education, 138
— his personal influences, 43
Hook, Dr., Vicar of Leeds, 80
Hooker, Richard, 65, 254
Hooper, Bishop, 207
Horner, Rev. L., *Coptic Versions*, 44
Hort, Dr., 9, 12
Hubert, 32
Humanism, 42
Humanists, the English, 137

Ignatius, Bishop of Antioch, 125
Incarnation, the, 60
Infallibility, **50** *ff.*
— of the Pope, 159, 164
Interdenominationalism, 149
Irenæus, Bishop of Lyons, 123

Jarrow, 133
Jerusalem bishopric, 183
Jesus Christ, founds the Church, 11
— His methods, 13
Jewel, John (1522-1571), 42, 250
John, King of England, 33
Justification by Faith, 183
Justin Martyr, 102

Khomiakoff, A. S., 67
King's Book, the, 243
King's College, Cambridge, 38
— School, the, 237

Lambeth Appeal, the, 157
Lambeth Conference, report of, 124, 175
— conversations, the, 22
Latimer, 42
Latin rite, the, 163
Latvia, 179
Laud, William, Archbishop of Canterbury, 140, 208, 260
Law and the Gospel, the, 97
Lay Folks' Mass Book, the, 35
Laying on of hands, 18
Leach, A. P., 136, 138, 153
Learning, influence of, 42
Lecky, 198
Legalism, 97
Legates, Papal, 30, 33, 39
Leighton, Robert, 121, 277
Leo XIII., 159, 170
Liberalism, 142
Library, the Cathedral, 236
Lightfoot, Dr. J. B., Bishop of Durham, 6, 44
Linacre, 138
Litany, the, 95
Liturgical authority, 75
Lollardism, 34, 36
Lucar, Cyril, Patriarch of Constantinople, 165
Luther, Dr. Martin, 186
Lutheranism, 41, 182, 183, **184**

Malines conversations, the, 158
Malmesbury, 27, 133
Marsiglio of Padua, 34
Mary, Queen of England, 83, 139
Mason, Dr. A. J., 117
Mason, 122
Mass, the, 90
Mecklenburg, 179
Mediæval Church, the, **31** *ff.*
— education, 134
Melanchthon, 183
Mercier, Cardinal, 158, 160, 166, 169, 176
Methodist churches, 195
Middle Ages, religion of the, 35
Middleton, Bishop, 47
Milton, John, 139
Ministry, 18
— the Christian, 113, **126** *ff.*
Mitre, the, 87
Moberly, Dr. Robert, 112, 113, 177
Modernism, 46
Modernist tendency, 77
Monasteries, suppression of the, 37
Montague, Richard, 264
Montmorency, J. E. G. de, 153
Moravians, the, 179
More, Sir Thomas, 42
Morning Service, the, 93
Moule, Dr. Handley, Bishop of Durham, 91
Moulin, Du, 119
Music, 103
Mystery religions, 63

Nationalism and education, 143
Newman, Cardinal, 166
Nicholson, Bishop, 208
Nonconformist services, 74, 75
— orders, 175
Nonconformists excluded from Universities, 140
— and the Church, 175

Offa, 30
Orders, doctrine of, 176
— non-episcopal, 119, 128, 181
— mutual recognition of, 176, 177
— recognition of, 181
Ordination, 63, 114, 127, 178
Organization, **111** *ff.*
Origen, 7
Ornaments rubric, the, **81**
Oswald, King of Northumbria, 26
Oswald, Bishop of Worcester, 28
Oxford Movement, the, 46, 93
— University of, 134

Papa alterius orbis, 163
Papacy, the, **159** *ff.*
— the primacy of, 162
Papal supremacy, 40, **159** *ff.*
Paris, University of, 134
Parish priest, duty of the, 95
Parker, Archbishop, 207
Parry, Bishop, 208
Patriarch of the West, the, 162
Patriarchate, an Anglo-Saxon, 168
Patronage, 202
Pattison, Mark, 43
Paul and the Roman Church, 9
Pearson, *Vindiciæ Ignatianæ*, 44
Penance, 63
Persecution, effect of, 41
— religious, 44
Peter, St., 3, 4, 5, 6, 33
— authority of, 160
— position of, 8
— the promise to, **4** *ff.*
Peter Lombard, 55
Præmunire, statute of, 34
Prayer Book, the First, 82, 90
— — the Second, 81, 82, 90
— — of 1662, 83
— — authority of, 76
— — revision, 106
— — the principles of the, 71
Predestination, 183
Presbyterianism, 15, 113

Presbyters, 126
Presence, the Real, 91, 92
Primacy of the Pope, 162
Principal service, the, 88
Pritchett, Bishop, 211
Property and finance, commission on, 217, 223, 229
Protestant churches, ministry of, 124
Protestantism, 15
— the Church of England and Continental, 182
Provisors, Statute of, 34
Pseudo-Decretals, 33

Quakers, the, 3, 111

Radcliffe, Sir George, 268
Rashdall, Dr., Dean of Carlisle, 134, 228, 229
Ravis, Bishop, 208
Rawlinson, Rev. A. J., 53, 68
Real Presence, the, **173**
Reality, 61
Reformation, the, **37** *ff.*, 55
— education, 137
— evangelical influences of, 41
— political causes of, 37
— principles of, 39, 40
— respect for tradition, 41
Religious freedom, 151
Renaissance, the, 137
Reordination, 120
Reservation, **101**
— for Communion, 102
— for worship, 103
Reunion, 203
Revision, reason for, 106, 107
Rite, merits of the English, 74
Roman Catholic services, 75
Roman Catholics, our relations to, 175
Rome, 185
— Bishop of, Patriarch of the West, 162
— English college at, 30
— Church of, 5, 6, 7
— — and Biblical criticism, 167
— — England and the, 30, 32, 33, 38, 158
— — and peace, 167
Russian education, 131

Sacraments, the, 17, **61** *ff.*
— Christ the minister of, 115
— meaning of, 123
— Nonconformist, 115
— the number of, 64
— Presbyterian view of the, 171
— teaching of English Church, 65
Sacraments, theology of the, 64
Sacrifice, the Eucharistic, 90, 169, 170
Sanderson, Robert, 267
Sandys, Sir Edwyn, 257
Sangnier, Marc, 167
Saxony, 179
Scotland, Church of, 194
— episcopacy in, 121
Scripture, supremacy of, **48** *ff.*
Seabury, Bishop, 46
Secondary schools, 149
Secularization of education, 143
Seebohm, *Oxford Reformers*, 42
Selden, John, 266
Service, hours of, 93
— the principal, 93
Services, arrangement of, **88** *ff.*
— variety in, 78
Sheldon, Gilbert, Archbishop of Canterbury, 271
Simon Bar Jonah, 5
Simpson, Dr. Carnegie, 155, 171, 177, 178, 179
Smith, Bishop, 208
Söderblom, Archbishop, 167, 179, 183, 184, 185, 189, 197, 204
Sohm, 111
Sophia, St., 165
South, Robert, 284
State, Church and, 192
— the, and education, 142
Statutes, the Cathedral, 206, 207, 209, 212, 218, 224
Stephens, *The English Church from the Norman Conquest*, 36
Stillingfleet, Edward, 286
Stubbs, Dr. William, Bishop of Oxford, 135
Succession, Apostolic, 15, 179
Supremacy, Papal, 32, 33, 163
— the Royal, 193
Sweden, Church of, 183
Swete, Dr. H. B., 123

Taylor, Jeremy, 277
Tendencies in the Church, 77
Tewkesbury Abbey, 38
Theodore of Tarsus, Archbishop of Canterbury, 25, 26, 27
Theological colleges, 201
Thomas Aquinas, St., 67, 174
Thorndike, Herbert, 271
Tillotson, Archbishop, 120
Toleration in religion, 44
Tractarian revival, the, 121
Traditions, 52
Traditional tendency, 77
Transubstantiation, 64, 170
Trinity, doctrine of the, 60

Truth, nature of religious, 155
Tunstall, Cuthbert, Bishop of Durham, 39, 41, 42, 193, 249
Turner, Dr. C. H., 123

Undenominationalism, 149
Uniformity, Act of 1559, 81
—— 1662, 45, 140
Unitarian, 195
University, the mediæval, 134
Usher, James, Archbishop of Armagh, 264

Variety in services, 78
Vatican decrees, the, 159
Vestments, the Eucharistic, 80, **81** *ff.*, 85, 86
Virgin Birth, the, 58
Visitation Court, publicity of the, 222
Vocation, 178

Wake, William, 289
Wakeman, Bishop, 207
Waldensian Church, the, 179
Walton, *Polyglott*, 44
Ward, Wilfrid, 166
Wearmouth, 27
Westcote and Hort, *Greek Testament*, 44
Whitaker, William (1548-1595), 251
Whitby, Daniel, 287
Wilfrid, Archbishop of York, 29
William the Conqueror, 27, 32
William of Malmesbury, 33
William of Ockham, 34
Willibrord, 29
Winchcombe Abbey, 38
Winchester, 133
Wittenberg, 185
Wolsey, Cardinal, 38, 39
Wordsworth and White, *Vulgate*, 44
Worship, **70** *ff.*
Wotton, Sir Henry, 258
Wycliffe, John, 34, 36, 134, 136

NORWICH PUBLIC LIBRARIES

SEPTIC Tubercles
WITH

1946 – 58 . . 27.

59

of infectious disease which occurs in the house in which they are resident. See Rule 33.

Borrowers should read the Rules and Regulations from which the above are abstracts. A copy may be had free on application.

Sch. 1 L.28. 5,000.6.45. G. & W., Ltd.